

Vol. 8.  
ANTI-SLAVERY EXAMINER.

---

THE

W. W. Patton.

## CHATTEL PRINCIPLE

THE ABHORRENCE OF

JESUS CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES

OR,

NO REFUGE FOR AMERICAN SLAVERY

IN

The New Testament.

By  
Rev. Daniel W. Green.

NEW YORK:

PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN ANTISLAVERY SOCIETY,  
NO. 143 NASSAU STREET.

.....  
1839.

---

87 Please read and circulate. 40

## NEW TESTAMENT AGAINST SLAVERY.

---

"THE SON OF MAN IS COME TO SEEK AND TO SAVE  
THAT WHICH WAS LOST."

Is Jesus Christ in favor of American slavery? In 1776 THOMAS JEFFERSON, supported by a noble band of patriots and surrounded by the American people, opened his lips in the authoritative declaration: "*We hold these truths to be SELF-EVIDENT, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, LIBERTY, and the pursuit of happiness.*" And from the inmost heart of the multitudes around, and in a strong and clear voice, broke forth the unanimous and decisive answer: Amen — such truths we do indeed hold to be self-evident. And animated and sustained by a declaration, so inspiring and sublime, they rushed to arms, and as the result of agonizing efforts and dreadful sufferings, achieved under God the independence of their country. The great truth, whence they derived light and strength to assert and defend their rights, they made the foundation of their republic. And in the midst of *this* republic, must we prove, that He, who was the Truth, did not contradict "the truths" which He Himself, as their Creator, had made self-evident to mankind?

Is Jesus Christ in favor of American slavery? What, according to those laws which make it what it is, is American slavery? In the Statute-book of South Carolina thus it is written: "Slaves shall be

---

\* Stroud's Slave Laws, p. 23.

deceit, sold, taken, reputed and adjudged in law to be *chattels personal* in the hands of their owners and possessors, and their executors, administrators and assigns, to all intents, constructions and purposes whatever." The very root of American slavery consists in the assumption, that *law has reduced men to chattels*. But this assumption is, and must be, a gross falsehood. Men and cattle are separated from each other by the Creator, immutably, eternally, and by an impassable gulf. To confound or identify men and cattle must be to lie most wantonly, impudently, and maliciously. And must we prove, that Jesus Christ is not in favor of palpable, monstrous falsehood?

Is Jesus Christ in favor of American slavery? How can a system, built upon a stout and impudent denial of self-evident truth—a system of treating men like cattle—operate? Thomas Jefferson shall answer. Hear him. "The whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions; the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submission on the other. The parent storms, the child looks on, catches the lineaments of wrath, puts on the same airs in the circle of smaller slaves, gives loose to his worst passions, and thus nursed, educated, and daily exercised in tyranny, can not but be stamped by it with odious peculiarities. The man must be a prodigy, who can retain his manners and morals undepraved by such circumstances." Such is the practical operation of a system, which puts men and cattle into the same family and treats them alike. And must we prove, that Jesus Christ is not in favor of a school where the worst vices in their most hateful forms are systematically and efficiently taught and practiced?

Is Jesus Christ in favor of American slavery? What, in 1818, did the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church affirm respecting its nature and operation? "Slavery creates a paradox in the moral system—it exhibits rational, accountable, and immortal beings, in such circumstances as scarcely to leave them the power of moral action. It exhibits them as dependent on the will of others, whether they shall receive religious instruction; whether they shall know and worship the true God; whether they shall enjoy the ordinances of the gospel; whether they shall perform the duties and cherish the endearments of husbands and wives, parents and children, neighbors and

\* Notes on Virginia.

† Minutes of the General Assembly for 1818, p. 29.

friendly, whether they shall preserve their charity and purity, or regard the dictates of justice and humanity. Such are some of the consequences of slavery; consequences not imaginary, but which connect themselves with its very existence. The evils to which the slave is *always* exposed, often take place in their very worst degree and form; and where all of them do not take place, still the slave is deprived of his natural rights, degraded as a human being, and exposed to the danger of passing into the hands of a master who may inflict upon him all the hardships and injuries which inhumanity and avarice may suggest.\* Must we prove, that Jesus Christ is not in favor of such things?

Is Jesus Christ in favor of American slavery? It is already widely felt and openly acknowledged at the South, that they can not support slavery without sustaining the opposition of universal christendom. And Thomas Jefferson declared, that "he trembled for his country when he reflected, that God is just; that his justice can not sleep forever; that considering numbers, nature, and natural means only, a revolution of the wheel of fortune, an exchange of situation, is among possible events; that it may become practicable by supernatural influences! The Almighty has no attribute which can take sides with us in such a contest."† And must we prove, that Jesus Christ is not in favor of what universal christendom is impelled to abhor, denounce, and oppose;—is not in favor of what every attribute of Almighty God is armed against?

### "YE HAVE DESPISED THE POOR."

It is no man of straw, with whom in making out such proof we are called to contend. Would to God we had no other antagonist! Would to God that our labor of love could be regarded as a work of supererogation! But we may well be ashamed and grieved to find it necessary to "stop the mouths" of grave and learned ecclesiastics, who from the heights of Zion have undertaken to defend the institution of slavery. We speak not now of those, who amidst the monuments of oppression are engaged in the sacred vocation; who as ministers of the Gospel can "prophecy smooth things" to such as pollute the altar of Jehovah with human sacrifices; nay, who them-

\* Notes on Virginia.

revels and the victim and huddle the sacrifice. That they should put their Savior to the torture, to wring from his lips something in favor of slavery, is not to be wondered at. They consent to the murder of the children; can they respect the rights of the Father? But what shall we say of theological professors in the North—professors of sacred literature at our oldest divinity schools—who stand up to defend, both by argument and authority, southern slavery! And from the Bible! Who, Balaam-like, try a thousand expedients to force from the mouth of Jehovah a sentence which they know the heart of Jehovah abhors! Surely we have here something more mischievous and formidable than a man of straw. More than two years ago, and just before the meeting of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, appeared an article in the *Biblical Repository*,\* understood to be from the pen of the Professor of Sacred Literature at Princeton, in which an effort is made to show, that slavery, whatever may be said of any abuses of it, is not a violation of the precepts of the Gospel. This article, we are informed, was industriously and extensively distributed among the members of the General Assembly—a body of men, who by a frightful majority seemed already too much disposed to wink at the horrors of slavery. The effect of the Princeton Apology on the southern mind, we have high authority for saying, has been most decisive and injurious. It has contributed greatly to turn the public eye off from the sin—from the inherent and necessary evils of slavery to incidental evils, which the abuse of it might be expected to occasion. And how few can be brought to admit, that whatever abuses may prevail nobody knows where or how, any such thing is chargeable upon them! Thus our Princeton prophet has done what he could to lay the southern conscience asleep upon ingenious perversions of the sacred volume!

About a year after this, an effort in the same direction was jointly made by Dr. Fisk and Prof. Stuart. In a letter to a Methodist clergyman, Mr. Merritt, published in *Zion's Herald*, Dr. Fisk gives utterance to such things as the following:—

---

\* For April, 1836. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church met in the following month at Pittsburgh, where, in pamphlet form, this article was distributed. The following appeared upon the title page:

"But that you and the public may see and feel, that you have the ablest and those who are among the honestest men of this age, arrayed against you, be pleased to notice the following letter from Prof. Stuart. I wrote to him, knowing as I did his integrity of purpose, his unflinching regard for truth, as well as his deserved reputation as a scholar and biblical critic, proposing the following questions:—

1. Does the New Testament directly or indirectly teach, that slavery existed in the primitive church?

2. In 1 Tim. vi. 2, And they that have believing masters, &c., what is the relation expressed or implied between "they" (servants) and "believing masters?" And what are your reasons for the construction of the passage?

3. What was the character of ancient and eastern slavery?—Especially what (legal) power did this relation give the master over the slave?

#### PROFESSOR STUART'S REPLY.

ANSWER, 10th April, 1837.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—Yours is before me. A sickness of three months' standing (typhus fever,) in which I have just escaped death, and which still confines me to my house, renders it impossible for me to answer your letter at large.

1. The precepts of the New Testament respecting the demeanor of slaves and of their masters, beyond all question, recognize the existence of slavery. The masters are in part "believing masters," so that a precept to them, how they are to behave as *masters*, recognizes that the relation may still exist, *salva fide et salva ecclesia*, ("without violating the Christian faith or the church.") Otherwise, Paul had nothing to do but to cut the band asunder at once. He could not lawfully and properly temporize with a *malum in se*, ("that which is in itself sin.")

If any one doubts, let him take the case of Paul's sending Onesimus back to Philemon, with an apology for his running away, and sending him back to be his servant for life. The relation did exist, may exist. The *abuse* of it is the essential and fundamental wrong. Not that the theory of slavery is in itself right. No; "Love thy neighbor as thyself," "Do unto others that which ye would that others should do unto you," decide against this. But the relation once constituted and continued, is not such a *malum in se* as calls for immediate and violent disruption at all hazards. So Paul did not counsel.

2. 1 Tim. vi. 2, expresses the sentiment, that slaves, who are Christians and have Christian masters, are not, on that account, and because as *Christians they are brethren*, to forego the reverence due to them as masters. That is, the relation of master and slave is not, as a matter of course, abrogated between all Christians. Nay, servants should in such a case, *a fortiori*, do their duty cheerfully. This sentiment lies on the very face of the case. What the master's duty in

from their easy bold respect to *Manilla*, is another quality, and cannot be displayed to disadvantage.

It is only six years, since the complaint with Greek or *Panama* anti-slavery, the slavery among the Christians has ever been made. The *Manilla* vessel was taken among Christian nations. Slaves were property in Greece and Rome. What decides all? Most about their relations. Their treatment, indeed, as it does now, on the temper of their masters. The power of the master over the slave was, for a long time, that of *life and death*. Horrible cruelties, at least mitigated. In the apostle's day, it was at least as great as now.

After all the opening and vehemence on this subject, which have been exhibited, the *good old Book* remains the same. Paul's conduct and advice are still safe guides. Paul knew well that Christianity would ultimately destroy slavery, as it certainly will. He knew too, that it would destroy monarchy and aristocracy from the earth; for it is fundamentally a doctrine of *true liberty and equality*. Yet Paul did not expect slavery or anarchy to be ousted in a day; and gave precepts to Christians respecting their demeanor *ad interim*.

With sincere and paternal regard,

Your friend and brother,

DR. STUART.

—This, sir, is doctrine that will stand, because it is *Bible doctrine*. The abolitionists, then, are on a wrong course. They have traveled out of the record; and if they would succeed, they must take a different position, and approach the subject in a different manner.

Respectfully yours,

W. FISK.

"SO THEY WRAP [SNARL] IT UP."

What are we taught here? That in the ecclesiastical organizations which grew up under the hands of the apostles, slavery was admitted as a relation, that did not violate the Christian faith; that the relation may now in like manner exist; that "the abuse of it is the essential and fundamental wrong;" and, of course, that American Christians may hold their own brethren in slavery without incurring guilt or inflicting injury. Thus according to *Prof. Stuart*, Jesus Christ has not a word to say against "the peculiar institutions" of the South. If our brethren there do not "abuse" the privilege of exacting unpaid labor, they may multiply their slaves to their hearts' content, without exposing themselves to the frown of the Savior or laying their Christian character open to the least suspicion. Could any trafficker in human flesh ask for greater latitude? And to crush





Slavery was everywhere, and among the Jews, degraded and degraded by the very spirit of Christianity, which it infested. There, almost in the earliest and fullest sense, Stuart describes, as "horrible cruelties." And in our own country, our "Christian" slaveholders, as it would be thought, had a philosopher and statesman, John Jay, to say, that they had agreed against an every attribute of the Almighty. With these things the Savior, everywhere came in contact, among the people to whose improvement and salvation he directed his living power; and yet not a word, not a syllable, in approval and commendation of such "horrible cruelties," escaped his lips. He saw—among the "covenant people" of Jehovah—he saw the babe plucked from the bosom of its mother; the wife torn from the embrace of her husband; the daughter driven to the market by the scourge of her own father;—he saw the word of God stolen up from those who, of all men, were especially entitled to its enlightening, quickening influence;—any, he saw men beaten for kneeling before the throne of heavenly mercy;—such things he saw without a word of admonition or reproof! No sympathy with them who suffered wrong—no indignation at them who inflicted wrong, moved his heart!

From the alleged silence of the Savior, when in contact with slavery among the Jews, our divines infer, that it is quite consistent with Christianity. And they affirm, that he saw it in its worst forms; that is, he witnessed what Prof. Stuart ventures to call "horrible cruelties." But what right have these interpreters of the sacred volume to regard any form of slavery which the Savior found, as "worst," or even bad? According to their inference—which they would thrust gag-wise into the mouths of abolitionists—his silence should seal up their lips. They ought to hold their tongues. They have no right to call any form of slavery bad—an abuse; much less, horribly cruel! Their inference is broad enough to protect the most brutal driver amidst his deadliest inflictions!

**"THINK NOT THAT I AM COME TO DESTROY THE LAW OR THE PROPHETS; I AM NOT COME TO DESTROY, BUT TO FULFILL."**

And did the Head of the new dispensation, then, fall so far behind the prophets of the old in a hearty and effective regard for suffering humanity? The forms of oppression which they witnessed, excited

their compassion and checked their indignation. "And when he had pointed and pointed, they secretly blasphemed and murmured. They could not change the ordinance, who 'did not sell themselves for silver, and gave him not for his wages; who increased every day upon their afflictions, and feared them with the fear of wickedness; who, shaming themselves from their own flesh, delivered their own children.' Professors of piety, joined with the opposition of the poor, they held up to universal scorn and execration, as the drag of hypocrisy. They wanted the creature of men pronounced, that he could escape the wrath of Jehovah only by self-denial. And yet, according to the ecclesiastical will which we have to do, the Lord of these prophets passed by in silence just such excommunicates as he commanded them to expose and condemn! Every where, he came in contact with slavery in its worst form. "Horrible cruelties" forced themselves upon his notice; but not a word of rebuke or warning did he utter. He saw a boy given for a harlot, and a girl sold for wine, and they might drink, without the slightest feeling of displeasure, or any mark of disapprobation! To such disgusting and horrible conclusions, to the arguments which, from the fountains of sacred literature, are instilled on our churches, lead us! According to them, Jesus Christ, instead of coming as the light of the world, extinguished the torches which his own prophets had kindled, and plunged mankind into the palpable darkness of a starless midnight! O Saviour, in pity to thy suffering people, let thy temple be no longer used as a den of thieves!

**"THOU THOUGHTEST THAT I WAS ALTOGETHER  
SUCH AN ONE AS THYSELF."**

In passing by the worst forms of slavery, with which he every where came in contact among the Jews, the Saviour must have been inconsistent with himself. He was commissioned to preach glad tidings to the poor; to heal the broken-hearted; to preach deliverance to the captives; to set at liberty them that are bound; to preach the year of jubilee; in accordance with this commission, he bound himself, from the earliest date of his incarnation, to the poor, by the strongest ties; himself "had not where to lay



longer. As he speaking to Deacons, *Quaker* in 1840, he said, "I have furnished, 'decide against' the theory of slavery." And then, that these ecclesiastical theologians for slavery are made of the same material as the *Quaker* is; that he did not, in the *Quaker* of the time, apply the same principles to this particular form of slavery as he would have applied to that of the Indians or the *Quaker* of the *Quaker* agents, and which our *Quaker* professor declared to be the principle of the *Quaker*, duly acted on, would speedily extinguish. But remarkable it is, that a teacher should so loudly declare on behalf of the *Quaker* of the *Quaker* of the *Quaker*, and yet in the same principles which have been set forth and which bearing upon it—should so connect, as to *Quaker* the *Quaker*, that "slavery is not a crime," and at the same time leave the *Quaker* for its "speedy extinction!"

A higher authority than sustains *any* *Quaker* *Quaker* there can not be. All forms of reason, they are rays from the face of Jehovah. Not only are their presence and power self-manifested, but they also shed a strong and clear light around them. In this light, *any* *Quaker* are visible. Luminaries themselves, it is their office to enlighten. To their authority, in every department of thought, the same mind responds promptly, gratefully, fully. And by their authority, no explanation, proof, and disposal of whatever engages his attention and engages his powers as a reasonable and reasoning creature. For what, when thus employed and when most successful, is the utmost he can accomplish? Why, to make his conclusions which he would establish and extend, *clear in the light of reason*;—in other words, to evince that they are reasonable. He expects, that those with whom he has to do, will acknowledge the authority of principle—will see whatever is exhibited in the light of reason. If they require him to go further, and, in order to convince them, to do something more than show that the doctrine he maintains, and the methods he proposes, are accordant with reason—are illustrated and supported by self-evident truths—they are plainly *beside themselves*. They have lost the use of reason. They are not to be argued with. They belong to the madhouse.

† The same, p. 34.

‡ The same, p. 13.

THEY HAVE Brought REASON TOGETHER, BATTER  
DOWN THE "ROCK" AND THE "MOUNTAIN."

Can they, by turning away from "self-evident truths" to an  
altogether new system? Can these truths be contradicted or applied  
without? Do we search for something there to strengthen their place, or  
to break their force, or reduce their authority? Do we long to find  
something there, in the form of premises or conclusions, of premises  
or of inductions, in broad statements or blind hints, exhortations or  
sentences which may cut us free from the light and power of self-  
evident truths? And what if we were to discover what we were thus in  
search of?—something directly or indirectly, expressly or impliedly  
prejudicial to the principles, which reason, placing on under, the  
authority of makes self-evident? In what estimation is that case,  
would we be constrained to hold the Bible? Could we longer, hence  
it, as the book of God? *The book of God opposed to the authority of  
reason!* Why, before what tribunal do we dispose of the claims of  
the sacred volume to divine authority? The tribunal of reason.  
*Thus every one acknowledges the moment he begins to reason on the  
subject.* And what must reason do with a book, which reduced the  
authority of its own principles—broke the force of self-evident truths?  
Is he not, by way of eminence, the apostle of infidelity, who, as a  
minister of the gospel or a professor of sacred literature, exerts him-  
self, with whatever arts of ingenuity or show of piety, to exalt the  
Bible at the expense of reason? Let such arts succeed and such  
piety prevail, and Jesus Christ is "crucified afresh and put to an open  
shame."

What saith the Princeton professor? Why, in spite of "general  
principles" and "clear, as we may think, the arguments" against one-  
ness, there have been thousands of ENLIGHTENED and good-  
men, who honestly believe it to be of all forms of government—the best  
and most acceptable to God. Now, these "good men" must have  
been thus warmly in favor of despotism, in consequence of their op-  
position to, their being "enlightened." In other words, the light,  
which in such abundance they enjoyed, conducted them to the position  
in favor of despotism, where the Princeton professor so heartily dis-  
cusses.

hands with them, or they must have forced their way through the  
 of the beloved influence. His own power is sufficient to  
 once to the light, they became what he found them, enlightened and  
 despotic. It is certain that the light is not the same as the  
 the enlightened man?—what confidence the subject with which he is  
 and the no more concerned, freedom of their liberty?—as the  
 power? Good and honest ministers of the light, which is the  
 poured around them! Of such, what says Professor Stuart?—  
 old Bach?—Their authority, where “general principles” are  
 the least respect, must be small indeed. But if the enlightened  
 the light, they have become the advocates of despotism, then is the  
 nation of the best form of government not most acceptable?—  
 It is sustained by the authority of reason, by the word of God,  
 by the will of Heaven!—Is this the doctrine which permits  
 certain theological domination, it must be easy to ascend, for the  
 spirit which they breathe, and the general influence which they exert.  
 Why did not the Princeton professor place this “general principle”  
 as a shield, heaven-wrought and reason-approved, over that despotic  
 form of despotism which prevails among the churches of the South,  
 and leave the “peculiar institutions”?—he is so forward to defend, under  
 its protection?—Is it not better to have no shield at all?  
 What is the “general principle”? to which, whatever may become  
 of despotism with its “honest” admirers and “enlightened” support-  
 ers, human governments should be universally and carefully adjusted?  
 Clearly this—that as capable of, man is entitled to, self-government.  
 And this is a specific form of a still more general principle which  
 may well be pronounced self-evident—that every thing should be  
 treated according to its nature. The mind that can doubt of this, must  
 be incapable of rational conviction. Man, then, it is the dictate of  
 reason, it is the voice of Jehovah—must be treated as a *man*. What  
 is he?—What are his distinctive attributes? The Creator impressed  
 his own image on him. In this were found the grand peculiarities of  
 his character. Here shone his glory. Here reason manifested its  
 laws. Here the will puts forth its volitions. Here in the crown of  
 immortality. Why such endowments?—What furnished the image  
 of Jehovah—is he not capable of self-government?—And is he not  
 to be so treated?—Within the sphere where the laws of reason place  
 him, may he not act according to his choice—carry out his own vol-  
 itions?—may he not enjoy life, exult in freedom, and pursue his will

[illegible]

color, sound, and gesture, contented to mingling with the  
employing honest words and clearly phrases, is content with  
coming vagueness and ambiguity, what might possibly be  
exist in the regions of fancy.

FOR RULERS ARE NOT A TERROR TO GOOD WORK,  
BUT TO THE EVIL."

But are we, in maintaining the principle of self-government, to overlook the unripe, or neglected, or broken powers of any of our fellow-men (with whom we may be connected)—or the strong physical, vicious propensities, or criminal pursuits of others? Certainly not. But in providing for their welfare, we are to exert influences and impose restraints suited to their character. In yielding those prerogatives which the social of our nature authorizes us to employ for their benefit, we are to regard them as they are in truth, not things, not cattle, not articles of merchandize, but men, our fellow-men—reflecting, from however battered and broken a surface, reflecting with us the image of a common Father. And the great principle of self-government is to be the basis, to which the whole structure of discipline under which they may be placed, should be adapted. From the nursery and village school on to the work-house and state-prison, this principle is ever and in all things to be before the eyes, present in the thoughts, warm on the heart. Otherwise, God is insulted, while His image is despised and abused. Yes, indeed; we remember, that in carrying out the principle of self-government, multiplied embarrassments and obstructions grow out of wickedness on the one hand and passion on the other. Such difficulties and obstacles we are far enough from overlooking. But where are they to be found? Are imbecility and wickedness, bad hearts and bad heads, confined to the bottom of society? Alas, the weakest of the weak, and the desperately wicked, often occupy the high places of the earth, reducing every thing within their reach to subserviency to the foulest purposes. Nay, the very power they have usurped, has often been the chief instrument of turning their heads, inflaming their passions, corrupting their hearts. All the world knows, that the possession of arbitrary power has a strong tendency to make men shamelessly wicked and infernally mischievous. And this, whether the vassal over whom they domineer, be few or many. If you can not trust



...with himself, will not let his fellow-men, his countrymen, and  
...the indignities incident to slavery, to the  
...of the slave, and the degradation of the race.

THOU THAT PREACHEST A MAN SHOULD NOT  
STEAL, DOST THOU STEAL?

In the slaveholder, the most audacious and remorseless of all despots, to be intrusted with the discipline of the injured men whom he himself has reduced to cattle?—with the discipline by which they are to be prepared to yield the persons and enjoy the privileges of freemen? Alas, of such discipline as he can furnish, in the relation of owner to property, they have had enough. From this springs the very ignorance and vice, which in the view of many lie in the way of their immediate enfranchisement. He it is, who has darkened their eyes and crippled their powers. And are they to look to him for illumination and renewed vigor!—and expect “grapes from thorns and figs from thistles!” Heaven forbid! When, according to arrangements which had assumed the sacred name of law, he consented to receive and use them as property, he forfeited all claims to the esteem and confidence, not only of the helpless sufferers themselves, but also of every philanthropist. In becoming a slaveholder, he became the enemy of mankind. The very act was a declaration of war upon human nature. What less can be made of the process of turning men to cattle? It is rank absurdity—it is the height of madness, to propose to employ him to train, for the places of freemen, those whom he has wantonly robbed of every right—whom he has stolen from themselves. Sooner place Burke, who used to murder for the sake of selling bodies to the dissector, at the head of a hospital. Why, what have our slaveholders been about these two hundred years? Have they not been constantly and earnestly engaged in the work of education?—training up their human cattle? And how? Thomas Jefferson shall answer. “The whole commerce between master and slave, is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions: the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submission on the other.” Is this the way to fit the unprepared for the duties and privileges of American citizens? Will the evils of the dreadful process be diminished by adding to it length? What in 1818 was the unanimous testimony of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian





to be in full accordance with the law of God, and to be in full accordance with the law of man. In that volume, which will be our guide to the life of the soul, which is the object of our study, we are participating the lessons which God has taught. There, therefore, the Bible requires us reverently to listen to carefully to appropriate, and most diligently and faithfully to act upon in every direction, and on all occasions.

Why, our Savior goes so far in doing honor to reason, as to acknowledge men universally to dispose of the characteristic peculiarities and distinctive features of the Gospel in the light of its principles. "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." Natural religion—the principles which nature reveals, and the lessons which nature teaches—he thus makes a test of the truth and authority of revealed religion. So far was he, as a teacher, from shrinking from the clearest and most piercing rays of reason—from calling off the attention of those around him from the import, bearings, and practical application of general principles. And those who would have us escape from the pressure of self-evident truths, by betaking ourselves to the doctrines and precepts of Christianity, whatever airs of piety they may put on, do foul dishonor to the Savior of mankind.

And what shall we say of the Golden Rule, which, according to the Savior, comprehends all the precepts of the Bible? "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets."

According to this maxim, in human consciousness, universally, may be found, 1. The standard whereby, in all the relations and circumstances of life, we may determine what Heaven demands and expects of us. 2. The just application of this standard, is practicable for, and obligatory upon, every child of Adam. 3. The qualification requisite to a just application of this rule to all the cases in which we can be concerned, is simply this—to regard all the members of the human family as our brethren, our equals.

In other words, the Savior here teaches us, that in the principles and laws of reason, we have an infallible guide in all the relations and circumstances of life; that nothing can hinder our following this

But this, in the Savior, looks like nothing reprehensible  
—like decrying his authority or general principles—like  
existing himself at the expense of reason!—like opening the Gospel for those whose practice is at variance with the  
of humanity!

"WHY DO YE NOT UNDERSTAND MY SPEECH; EVEN  
BECAUSE YE CAN NOT HEAR MY WORD."

They strangely misunderstand and grossly misrepresent this doctrine, who charge upon it the absurdities and mischiefs which any "liberal system" can not but produce. In all its bearings, tendencies, and effects, it is directly contrary and powerfully hostile to any such system. EQUALITY OF RIGHTS, the doctrine asserts; and this necessarily opens the way for *variety of condition*. In other words, every child of Adam has, from the Creator, the inalienable right of wielding, within reasonable limits, his own powers, and employing his own resources, according to his own choice; while he respects his social relations, to promote as he will his own welfare. But *work*—his own powers and resources, and not another's, are thus inalienably put under his control. The Creator made every

man free in whatever he may do to contribute to the welfare of his fellow-men. No man may lawfully exercise dominion over another. The law now not hinder the strong, nor may the strong crush the feeble. Every man may make the most of himself in his own sphere of action. Now, as in the constitutional orderments, and natural opportunities and lawful possessions of mankind, infinite variety prevails in exerting each human in his own sphere according to his own choice, the variety of human condition can be little less than infinite. Thus equality of rights opens the way for variety of condition.

But with all this variety of make, merits, and condition, considered individually, the children of Adam are bound together by obligations which can never be dissolved. They are mutually united by the bond of their nature. Hence mutual dependence and mutual claims. While each is inalienably entitled to assert and enjoy his own personality as a man, each owes to all and all to each, various relations. While each owns and honors the individual all are to own and honor the social of their nature. Now, the Golden Rule distinctly recognizes, lays its requisitions upon, and extends its obligations to, the whole nature of man, in his individual capacities and social relations. What higher honor could it do to man, as an individual, than to constitute him the judge, by whose decision, when fairly considered, all the claims of his fellows should be authoritatively and definitely disposed of? "Whatsoever ye would" have done to you, so do ye to others. Every member of the family of Adam, placing himself in the position here pointed out, is competent and authorized to pass judgment on all the cases in social life in which he may be concerned. Could higher responsibilities or greater confidence be reposed in men individually? And then, how are their claims upon each other herein magnified! What inherent worth and solid dignity are ascribed to the social of their nature! In every man with whom I may have to do, I am to recognize the presence of *another self*, whose case I am to make *my own*. And thus I am to dispose of whatever claims he may urge upon me.

Thus, in accordance with the Golden Rule, mankind are naturally brought, in the voluntary use of their powers and resources, to promote each other's welfare. As his contribution to this great object, it is the inalienable birth-right of every child of Adam, to engage in whatever he may possess. With exalted powers and large resources, he has a natural claim to a correspondant field of effort. If his



...the Golden Rule can not endure; the other is...  
...and himself.

**"LOVE WORKETH NO HILL TO HIS NEIGHBOR."**

Take unto the Golden Rule in the second great commandment—  
"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." "A certain lawyer," who  
seems to have been fond of applying the doctrine of limitation of  
human obligations, once demanded of the Savior, within what limits the  
meaning of the word "neighbor" ought to be confined. "And who  
is my neighbor?" The parable of the good Samaritan set that mat-  
ter in the clearest light, and made it manifest and certain, that every  
man whom we could reach with our sympathy and assistance, was  
our neighbor, entitled to the same regard which we cherished for our-  
selves. Consistently with such obligations, can slavery, as a rela-  
tion, be maintained? Is it then a *labor of love*—such love as we  
cherish for ourselves—to strip a child of Adam of all the prerogatives  
and privileges which are his inalienable birth-right?—To obscure his  
reason, crush his will, and trample on his immortality?—To shut  
home to the inmost of his being, and break the heart of his heart?—  
To thrust him out of the human family, and dispose of him as a chattel—  
as a thing in the hands of an owner, a beast under the lash of  
a driver? All this, apart from every thing incidental and extrac-  
taneous, belongs to the RELATION, in which slavery, as such, consists.  
All this—well fed or ill fed, underwrought or overwrought, clothed or  
naked, caressed or kicked, whether idle songs break from his thought-  
less tongue or "tears be his meat night and day," fondly cherished or  
cruelly murdered;—all this ENTERS VITALLY INTO THE RELATION  
ITSELF, by which every slave, AS A SLAVE, is set apart from the rest  
of the human family. Is it an exercise of love, to place our "neigh-  
bor" under the crushing weight, the killing power, of such a relation?  
—to apply the murderous steel to the very vitals of his humanity?





...the war of slavery! ... my right eye ... it is ...  
...the war of slavery! ... my right eye ... it is ...  
...the war of slavery! ... my right eye ... it is ...  
...the war of slavery! ... my right eye ... it is ...  
...the war of slavery! ... my right eye ... it is ...

...of Christ admit, that the Golden Rule and the second  
commandment "decide against the theory of slavery as being in  
accord with." What, then, is their relation to the particular propo-  
sitions, and usages, which are authorized and enjoined in  
New Testament? Of all these, they are the summary expression  
the comprehensive description. No precept in the Bible enforces  
our mutual obligations, can be more or less than the application of  
these injunctions to specific relations or particular occasions and con-  
ditions. Neither in the Old Testament nor the New, do precepts  
teach or laws enjoin, any thing which the Golden Rule and the second  
great command do not contain. Whatever they forbid, no other pre-  
cept can require; and whatever they require, no other precept can  
forbid. What, then, does he attempt, who turns over the sacred  
pages to find something in the way of permission or command, which  
may set him free from the obligations of the Golden Rule? What  
must his objects, methods, spirit be, to force him to enter upon such  
inquiries?—to compel him to search the Bible for such a purpose?  
Can he have good intentions, or be well employed? Is his frame of  
mind adapted to the study of the Bible?—to make his meaning plain  
and welcome? What must he think of God, to search his word in  
quest of gross inconsistencies and grave contradictions? Inconsis-  
tent legislation in Jehovah! Contradictory commands! Permissives  
at war with prohibitions! General requirements at variance with  
particular arrangements!

What must be the moral character of any institution which the  
Golden Rule decides against?—which the second great commandment  
condemns? It can not be decided, whether morally reprehensible or  
commendable otherwise it may be despised, twisted, abused, and  
other institutions will be all alike reprehensible and to be rejected.  
Consistent legislation by Jehovah, consistent commands, permissives  
and prohibitions, general requirements and particular arrangements.

of their peculiar and emotional, which have a tendency to lead us to a false estimate of things, it is greatly important, in our study of the New Testament, that the facts which upon the objects are seen from the right point of observation. Our mind we must take as some central point, amidst the general maxims and miscellaneous precepts, the known circumstances and characteristic arrangements, of primitive Christianity. Otherwise, wrong views and false conclusions will be the result of our studies. We can not, therefore, be too careful in trying to catch the general features and prevalent spirit of the New Testament institutions and arrangements. For to what could we more easily come, if we unwittingly pursue our inquiries under the bias of the prejudice, that the general maxims of social life which now prevail in this country, were current, on the authority of the Saviour, among the primitive Christians! That, for instance, wealth, station, talents, are the standard by which our claims upon, and our regard for, others, should be modified?—That those who are pinched by poverty, worn by disease, tasked in menial labors, or marked by features offensive to the taste of the artificial and capricious, are to be excluded from those refreshing and elevating influences which intelligence and refinement may be expected to exert; that thus they are to constitute a class by themselves, and to be made to know and keep their place at the very bottom of society? Or, what if we should think and speak of the primitive Christians, as if they had the same pecuniary resources as Heaven has lavished upon the American churches?—as if they were as remarkable for affluence, elegance, and splendor? Or, as if they had as high a position and as extensive an influence in politics and literature?—having directly or indirectly, the control over the high places of learning and of power?

If we should pursue our studies and arrange our arguments—if we should explain words and interpret language—under such a false view, what must inevitably be the results? What would be the worth of our conclusions? What confidence could be reposed in any instruction we might undertake to furnish? And is not, this the danger which the advocates and apologists of slavery, dignify of the bearing which primitive Christianity has upon it? They first explain the

“SO THAT YE ARE WITHOUT EXCUSE?”

Among the lessons of instruction which our Savior imparted, by his general teaching on the subject of slavery, that in which he set up the true *standard of greatness*, deserves particular attention. In representing the ambition of his disciples, he held up before them the way by which alone healthful aspirations for eminence could be obtained, and thus set the elements of true greatness in the clearest light. “Ye know, that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles, exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you; but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister; and whosoever of you will be chiefest, shall be servant of all.” In other words, through the selfishness and pride of mankind, the maxim widely prevalent in the world, that it is the privilege, prerogative, and mark of greatness, to EXACT SERVICE; that our superiority to others, while it authorizes us to relax the exertion of our own powers, gives us a fair title to the use of theirs; that “might,” while it exempts us from serving, “gives the right” to be served. The instructions of the Savior open the way to greatness for us in the opposite direction. Superiority to others, in whatever it may consist, gives us a claim to a wider field of exertion, and demands of us a larger amount of service. We can be great only as we are useful. And “might gives right” to bless our fellow men, by improving every opportunity and employing every faculty, affectionately, earnestly, and unwearyingly, in their service. Thus the greater the man, the more active, faithful, and useful the servant.

The Savior has himself taught us how this doctrine must be applied. He bids us improve every opportunity and employ every power, even through the most menial services, in blessing the human family. And to make this lesson shine upon our understanding, and make our hearts be enlisted, it is in a most instructive and attractive example. On a memorable occasion, and just before his crucifixion, he discharged for his disciples the most menial of all offices—taking,

...under the influence of such a man, set hands by  
 ...*Was it while attending the ...*  
 ...*...one man to make a chattel of another?*

...to provide for ourselves by useful labor, the only ...  
 ...to regard as a grave offence. After reminding the ...  
 ...Christian, that in addition to all his official exercises ...  
 ...with his own muscles earned his own bread, he calls him ...  
 ...to an arrangement which was supported by apostolical authority,  
 ...that if any would not work, neither should he eat." In the ...  
 ...earnest and solemn manner, and as a minister of the Lord Jesus  
 ...Christ, he commanded and exhorted those who neglected useful labor,  
 ...*with quietness to work and eat their own bread.*" What must be the  
 ...bearing of all this upon slavery? Could slavery be maintained where  
 ...every man eat the bread which himself had earned?—where idleness  
 ...was esteemed so great a crime, as to be reckoned worthy of starva-  
 ...tion as a punishment? How could unrequited labor be exacted, or  
 ...used, or needed? Must not every one in such a community con-  
 ...tribute his share to the general welfare?—and mutual service and  
 ...mutual support be the natural result?

The same apostle, in writing to another church, describes the true  
 ...source whence the means of liberality ought to be derived. "Let  
 ...*him that stole steal no more; but rather let him labor, working with*  
 ...*his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him*  
 ...*that needeth.*" Let this lesson, as from the lips of Jehovah, be pro-  
 ...claimed throughout the length and breadth of South Carolina. Let  
 ...it be universally welcomed and reduced to practice. Let thieves  
 ...give up what they had stolen to the lawful proprietors, cease stealing,  
 ...and begin at once to "labor, working with their hands," for neces-  
 ...sary and charitable purposes. Could slavery, in such a case, con-  
 ...tinue to exist? Surely not! Instead of exacting unpaid services  
 ...from others, every man would be busy, exerting himself not only to  
 ...provide for his own wants, but also to accumulate funds, "that he  
 ...might have to give to the needy." Slavery itself, upon its own  
 ...principles, at once and forever, would be destroyed. And thus  
 ...the source whence the means of liberality should be derived

(For men, that "laborer is worthy of his hire." We  
must not forget, however, that the principle is not confined to  
the laborer. And it is manifestly according to natural justice and  
good common arrangement. For the doctrine that I must leave  
you to work for me for whatever consideration I may please to  
give, fairly opens the way for the doctrine, that you, in turn, may  
force me to reward you whatever wages you may choose to exact for  
any services you may see fit to render. Thus slavery, even an  
voluntary servitude, is cut up by the root. Even the Princeton  
professor seems to regard it as a violation of the principle which  
unites work with wages.

The apostle James applies this principle to the claims of peasant  
laborers,—of those who hold the plough and thrust in the sickle. He  
calls the rich lordlings who exacted sweat and withhold wages to  
"weeping and howling," assuring them that the complaints of the  
injured laborer had entered into the ear of the Lord of Hosts, and  
that, as a result of their oppression, their riches were corrupted,  
and their garments moth-eaten; their gold and silver were cankered;  
that the rust of them should be a witness against them, and should  
eat their flesh as it were fire; that, in one word, they had heaped  
treasure together for the last days, when "miseries were coming upon  
them," the prospect of which might well drench them in tears and  
fill them with terror. If these admonitions and warnings were heeded  
there, would not "the South" break forth into "weeping and  
wailing, and gnashing of teeth?" What else are its rich men about,  
but withholding by a system of fraud, his wages from the laborer,  
who is wearing himself out under the impulse of fear, in cultivating  
their fields and producing their luxuries? Encouragement and sup-  
port do they derive from James, in maintaining the "peculiar in-  
stitution" whence they derived their wealth, which they call patri-  
archal, and boast of as the "corner-stone" of the republic?  
In the New Testament we have, moreover, the general injunction,  
"Honor all men." Under this broad precept, every form of human-  
ity may justly claim protection and respect. The invasion of any  
human right must be dishonor to humanity, and be a transgression  
of this command. How then, in the light of such obligations, can  
any man be a slave?

...in every day life, we are to go, we are to sit, we are to stand, we are to kneel, and to do all the things which belong to the various and usages of religious assemblies. Into these no man is to be admitted "respect of persons" to enter. "My brethren," do not say, "I have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons." For if there come unto your assembly a man with a gold ring, in costly apparel; and another come in such a poor man in vile raiment; and ye have respect to him that weareth the gay clothing, and say unto him, sit thou here in a good place; and say to the poor, stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool; are ye not then partial in yourselves, and are become judges of evil thoughts? *"If ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convicted of the law as transgressors."* On this general principle, then, religious assemblies ought to be regulated—that every man is to be admitted, not according to his *circumstances*—not according to any thing incidental to his *condition*; but according to his *moral worth*—according to the essential features and vital elements of his *character*. Gold rings and gay clothing, as they qualify no man for, can exclude no man to, a "good place" in the church. Nor can the "vile raiment of the poor man," fairly exclude him from any sphere, however exalted, which his heart and head may fit him to fill. To deny this, in theory or practice, is to degrade a man below a thing; for what are gold rings, or gay clothing, or vile raiment, but things, "which perish with the using?" And this must be "to commit sin, and be convicted of the law as transgressors."

In every, we have "respect of persons," strongly marked, and reduced to system. Here men are despised not merely for "the vile raiment," which may cover their scarred bodies. This is bad enough. But the deepest contempt for humanity here grows out of birth or complexion. Vile raiment may be, often is, the result of indolence, or improvidence, or extravagance. It may be, often is, an index of character. But how can I be responsible for the incidents of my birth, or for my complexion? To despise or honor me for these, is to be guilty of "respect of persons" in its grossest form, and with its worst effects. It is to reward or punish me for what I had nothing

to the silly, servile, stupid, & cruel, and to the  
giddy, to hold up the "fact" of going the very length and breadth  
of the earth, by attending all our dissensions. This would be a  
and in the way of inflicting infinitely greater injuries, to copy the  
"silly folly of Kossuth, in chaining and scourging the Atlantic.  
What, then, so far as the authority of the New Testament is con-  
cerned, becomes of slavery; which can not be maintained without  
force; nor for a single moment, without "respect of persons"? And  
how aggravated and unendurable? And what would become of this  
most pitiful, silly, and wicked arrangement in so many of our  
churches, in which worshipers of a dark complexion are to be shut  
out to the negro pew?

Nor are we permitted to confine this principle to religious assemblies. It is to pervade social life every where. Even where plenty, intelligence, and refinement, diffuse their brightest rays, the poor are to be welcomed with especial favor. "Then said he to him that bade him, when thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends, nor thy brethren, neither thy kinsmen, nor thy rich neighbors, lest they also bid thee again, and a recompense be made thee. But when thou makest a feast, call the poor and the maimed, the lame and the blind, and thou shalt be blessed; for they can not recompense thee, but thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just."

In the high places of social life then—in the parlor, the drawing-room, the saloon—special reference should be had, in every arrangement, to the comfort and improvement of those who are least able to provide for the cheapest rites of hospitality. For these, ample accommodations must be made, whatever may become of our innkeepers and rich neighbors. And for this good reason, that while such occasions signify little to the latter, to the former they are pregnant with good—raising their drooping spirits, cheering their desponding hearts, inspiring them with life, and hope, and joy. The rich and the poor

3 In Carlyle's Review of the Memoirs of Mirabeau, we have the following anecdote, illustrative of the character of a "grandmother" of the Court. "Tancy the dame Mirabeau sitting staidly towards the church font; another dame walking in or into the pews; and she; the dame Mirabeau disengaging this latter with a tap on the ear, and these words, 'Alors, va-tu en la messe, une nouvelle génération!'" Let them who justify the royal-papal arrangement, draw a lesson of this kind from the man-of-day there.



[illegible]

Can slavery, however modified, be consistent with such a gospel?—  
 a gospel which requires us, even amidst the highest form of social  
 life, to exert ourselves to raise the depressed by giving our warmest  
 sympathies to those who have the smallest share in the favor of the  
 world?

Those who are in "bonds" are set before us as deserving an especial remembrance. Their claims upon us are described as a modification of the Golden Rule—as one of the many forms to which its obligations are reducible. To them we are to extend the same affectionate regard as we would covet for ourselves, if the chains upon their limbs were fastened upon ours. To the benefits of this precept, the enslaved have a natural claim of the greatest strength. The wrongs they suffer, spring from a persecution which can hardly be surpassed in malignancy. Their birth and complexion are the occasion of the insults and injuries which they can neither endure nor escape. It is for the *will of God*, and not their own deserts, that they are loaded with chains. *This is persecution.*

Can I regard the slave as another self—can I put myself in his place—and be indifferent to his wrongs?—Especially, can I, thus affected, take sides with the oppressor?—Could I, in such a state of mind as the gospel requires me to cherish, reduce him to slavery or

describing in the most forcible manner the condition of the human family in the Church of Christ.

The general description of the Church of Christ, found in the New Testament, is highly instructive in that it is the subject of slavery. In one connection, the Bible declares that there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for we are all one in Christ Jesus. Here we have—1. A clear and strong declaration of the doctrine of human equality. "We are all one"—a truth which places all men on common ground, all wielding each his own power with such freedom, that one is the same as another.

2. This doctrine, self-evident in the light of reason, is affirmed by divine authority. "In Christ Jesus, we are all one." The natural equality of the human family is a part of the gospel. For—

3. All the human family are included in this description. Whether men or women, whether bond or free, whether Jews or Gentiles, all are alike entitled to the benefit of this doctrine. Wherever Christianity prevails, the artificial distinctions which grow out of birth, condition, sex, are done away. Natural distinctions are not destroyed. They are recognized, hallowed, confirmed. The gospel does not abolish the sexes, forbid a division of labor, or extinguish patriotism. It takes woman from beneath the feet, and places her by the side of man; delivers the manual laborer from "the yoke," and gives him wages for his work; and brings the Jew and the Gentile to embrace each other with fraternal love and confidence. Thus it raises all to a common level, gives to each the free use of his own powers and resources, binds all together in one dear and loving brotherhood. Such, according to the description of the apostle, was the influence, and such the effect of primitive Christianity. "Behold the picture!" Is it like American slavery, which, in all its tendencies and effects, is destructive of all oneness among brethren?

4. "Where the spirit of the Lord is," exclaims the same apostle, with his eye upon the condition and relations of the church, "where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." Where, then, may we reverently recognize the presence, and bow before the manifested power of the Spirit? There, where the laborer may not utter how



and in the *principle* which is the basis of which Christian history is the expression—the manifestation of the principle. It is a living principle, and Christian history is the history of the principle, and the principle. The former is the history of the principle of the latter. In the light of Christian principle, and of God's light only, we can judge of and explain Christian history. Christian history is occupied with the *consequences*, and the *character* of Christian character. The facts which are the history of the church, how Christian principle has been in the world, how it has appeared, what it has done, how it has been treated. To know such we have the various institutions, usages, customs, feelings, and writings of the church of Christ. And all these are the *consequences*, the *character* relation to Christian principle. They are the *consequences* of its power. Through them, it is revealed and manifested. For its light, they are to be studied, explained, and understood. But if they must be as unintelligible and insignificant as the letters of a book, scattered on the wind.

In the principles of Christianity, then, we have a comprehensive and faithful account of its objects, institutions, and usages—of how it must behave, and act, and suffer, in a world of sin and misery. For between the principles which God reveals, on the one hand, and the precepts he enjoins, the institutions he establishes, and the usages he approves, on the other, there must be consistency and harmony. Otherwise we impute to God what we must think in *practice* at war with principle. Does the Saviour, then, lay down the principle that our standing in the church must depend upon the habits, formed within us, of readily and heartily subverting the *rights* of others; and permit us in *practice* to invade the rights and trample on the happiness of our fellows, by reducing them to slavery. Does he, in principle and by example, require us to go all lengths in rendering mutual service, comprehending offices the most menial, as well as the most honorable; and permit us in *practice* to make *service* of our brethren, as if they were nothing better than "articles of merchandise?" Does he require us in principle "to work with quietness and eat our own bread;" and permit us in *practice* to wrack from our brethren the fruits of their unrequited toil? Does he in principle require us, obtaining from every form of *trade*, to employ our powers in useful labor, not only to provide for ourselves but also to relieve the indigence of others; and permit us in *practice*, obtain





and said, "I will do with things of the world as with things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, will I bring to glory and honour: and will bring to light things that are hid: that the things which are hid, shall be made manifest; and that the things which are mighty, shall be made weak." But the result of the seven months' mission, was a glorious triumph of Providence. The influence of the gospel, and the ordination was extensive with the triumph of Christianity. It was nothing new or strange, that Jehovah had called his glory to him, the wise and prudent, and that he would not be despised; for God's chosen people heard him gladly, while many of the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, had been called.

The description of character which the apostle records, could be adapted only to what are reckoned the very dregs of humanity. The foolish and the weak; the base and the contemptible, in the estimation of worldly pride and wisdom—these were they whose broken hearts were reached, and moulded, and refreshed by the gospel; these were they whom the apostle took to his bosom as his own brethren.

That class abounded at Corinth, may easily be admitted. They have a place in the enumeration of elements of which, according to the apostle, the church there was composed. The most remarkable class found there, consisted of "things which are not"—mere bodies, not admitted to the privileges of men, but degraded to a level with goods and chattels; of whom no account was made in such arrangements of society as subserved the improvement, and dignity, and happiness of mankind. How accurately this description applies to those who are crushed under the chattel principle!

The references which the apostle makes to the "deep poverty of the churches of Macedonia,"† and this to stir up the sluggish liberality of his Corinthian brethren, naturally leaves the impression, that the latter were by no means inferior to the former in the gifts of Providence. But, pressed with want and pinched by poverty as were the believers in Macedonia and Achaia, it pleased them to make a certain contribution for the poor saints which were at Jerusalem.‡

1 Cor. i. 27, 28.

2 Cor. viii. 2.

1 Rem. xv. 23.

But it appears, that Christians everywhere were filled with love, fear, and indignation so much so, that the apostle would demand each and every family from assuming the responsibility of the spiritual relation.

Now, how did these good people treat each other? Did the few among them, who were esteemed wise, mighty, or noble, use their influence and employ their power in oppressing the weak? In disposing of the "things that are not," or marketable commodities, in kneeling with them in prayer in the evening, and putting them up at auction the next morning! Did the church sell any of the converts to swell the "certain contribution for the poor Christians of Jerusalem?" Far otherwise—as far as possible! In these Christian communities where the influence of the apostles was most powerful and where the arrangements drew forth their highest commendations, believers treated each other as *brethren*, in the the strongest sense of that sweet word. So warm was their mutual love, so strong the public spirit, so open-handed and abundant the general liberality, that they are set forth as "*having all things common.*"<sup>1</sup> Did slaves and their holders here? Neither the one nor the other could in that relation to each other have breathed such an atmosphere. The appeal of the kneeling bondman, "Am I not a man and a brother?" must here have met with a prompt and powerful response.

The tests by which our Savior tries the character of his professed disciples, shed a strong light upon the genius of the gospel. In one connection,† an inquirer demands of the Savior, "What good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" After being reminded of the obligations which his social nature imposed upon him, he ventured, while claiming to be free from guilt in his relations to mankind, to demand, "what lack I yet?" The radical deficiency under which his character labored, the Savior was not long or obscure in pointing out. "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come and follow me." On this passage it is natural to suggest—

1. That we have here a *test of universal application*. The rectitude and benevolence of our Savior's character forbid us to suppose, that he would subject this inquirer, especially as he was highly amiable, to a trial, where eternal life was at stake, *peculiarly severe*.

\* 1 Cor. vii. 26, 27.

† Acts iv. 32.

‡ Luke xviii. 18—25.



himself, and it seems to have been only a fair exposition of the Lord's given command, and of course it must be applicable to all who are placed under the obligations of that precept. Those who cannot stand this test, as their character is radically imperfect and ungodly, must, with the inquirer to whom our Lord applied it, be pronounced unfit for the kingdom of heaven.

Will this least that our Savior can in that passage be understood to demand, that we disinterestedly and heartily devote ourselves to the welfare of mankind, "the poor" especially? We are to pit ourselves out to live with them, as we must do "in selling that we have" for their benefit—in other words, in employing our powers and resources to elevate their character, condition, and prospects. This our Savior did; and if we refuse to enter into sympathy and co-operation with him, how can we be his *followers*? Apply this test to the slaveholder. Instead of "selling that he hath" for the benefit of the poor, he buys the poor, and exacts their sweat with stripes, to enable him to "clothe himself in purple and fine linen, and fare sumptuously every day;" or, HE SELLS THE POOR to support the gospel and convert the heathen!

What, in describing the scenes of the final judgment, does our Savior teach us? By what standard must our character be estimated, and the retributions of eternity be awarded? A standard, which both the righteous and the wicked will be surprised to see erected. From the "offscouring of all things," the meanest specimen of humanity will be selected—a "stranger" in the hands of the oppressor, naked, hungry, sickly; and this stranger, placed in the midst of the assembled universe, by the side of the sovereign Judge, will be openly acknowledged as his representative. "Glory, honor, and immortality," will be the reward of those who had recognized and cheered their Lord through his outraged poor. And tribulation, anguish, and despair, will seize on "every soul of man," who had neglected or despised them. But whom, within the limits of our country, are we to regard especially as the representatives of our final Judge? Every feature of the Savior's picture finds its appropriate original in our enslaved countrymen.

1. They are the LEAST of his brethren.
2. They are subject to thirst and hunger, unable to command a cup of water or a crumb of bread.

3. They are exposed to wasting sickness, without the ability to procure a nurse or employ a physician.

4. They are emphatically "in prison," restrained by chains, loaded with whips, flogged, and under lashes. Not a wretch green with gall of the prisons of our country, who is exposed to a confinement as rigorous and heart-breaking as the law allows them to have continually and permanently.

5. And then they are emphatically, and peculiarly, and exclusively, *strangers*—*strangers* in the land which gave them birth. What else do we constrain to remain aliens in the midst of our free institutions? The Welch, the Swiss, the Irish? The Jews even? Alas, it is the negro only, who may not strike his roots into the soil. Every where we have conspired to treat him as a stranger—every where he is forced to feel himself a stranger. In the stage and steamboat, in the parlor and at our tables, in the scenes of business and in the scenes of amusement—even in the church of God and at the communion table, he is regarded as a stranger. The intelligent and religious are generally disgusted and horror-struck at the thought of his becoming identified with the citizens of our republic—so much so, that thousands of them have entered into a conspiracy to send him off "out of sight," to find a home on a foreign shore!—And justify themselves by openly alledging, that a "single drop" of his blood, in the veins of any human creature, must make him hateful to his fellow-citizens!—That nothing but banishment from "our coast," can redeem him from the scorn and contempt to which his "stranger" blood has reduced him among his own mother's children!

Who, then, in this land "of milk and honey," is "hungry and athirst," but the man from whom the law takes away the last crumb of bread and the smallest drop of water?

Who "naked," but the man whom the law strips of the last rag of clothing?

Who "sick," but the man whom the law deprives of the power of procuring medicine or sending for a physician?

Who "in prison," but the man who, all his life is under the control of merciless masters and cruel keepers?

Who a "stranger," but the man who is scornfully denied the cheapest courtesies of life—who is treated as an alien in his native country?

What is the grand indictment which describes their  
 oppression. There who are denied to the hand of the Judge,  
 the privilege of inflicting justice on their oppressors,  
 as they would their brother. Their was what is described above  
 as the indictment. What they had done is not described in the indictment.  
 What they neglected of duty, what they had never done, was the  
 ground of their "everlasting punishment." The representative of  
 their Judge, they had seen as hungry and they gave him no meat,  
 thirsty and they gave him no drink, a stranger and they took him not  
 in to eat and they clothed him not, sick and in prison and they visit  
 him not. In as much as they did not yield to the claims of  
 suffering humanity--did not exert themselves to bless the meanest of  
 the human family, they were driven away in their wickedness. The  
 indictment had run thus: I was a hungry and ye  
 stretched away the crust which might have saved me from starvation;  
 I was thirsty and ye dashed to the ground the "cup of cold water,"  
 which might have moistened my parched lips; I was a stranger and  
 ye drove me from the hovel which might have sheltered me from the  
 piercing wind; I was sick and ye scourged me to my task; in prison  
 and you sold me for my jail-fee--to what depths of hell must not those  
 who were convicted under such charges be consigned! And what is  
 the history of American slavery but one long indictment, describing  
 under ever-varying forms and hues just such injuries!

Not should it be forgotten, that these who incurred the displeasure  
 of their Judge, took far other views than he, of their own past history.  
 The charges which he brought against them, they heard with great  
 surprise. They were sure that they had never thus turned away  
 from his necessities. Indeed, when had they seen him thus subject  
 to poverty, insult, and oppression? Never. And as to that poor  
 friendless creature whom they left unpitied and unprotected in the hands  
 of the oppressor, and whom their Judge now presented as his own re-  
 presentative, they never once supposed, that he had any claim on  
 their compassion and assistance. Had they known, that he was  
 destined to so prominent a place at the final judgment, they would  
 have treated him as a human being, in despite of any racial, political,  
 or religious considerations. But neither their negative virtue nor  
 their voluntary ignorance could shield them from the penalty which  
 their selfishness had kindled,

Not amidst the general mission, the leading principles, the "comprehensiveness" of the gospel; amidst its comprehensive character, and authoritative basis of Christian character, do we find any hesitation in disposing of any particular allusions to such particular usages of the primitive churches as are supported by divine authority. The latter must be interpreted and understood in the light of the former. But how do the apologists and defenders of slavery proceed? Placing themselves amidst the arrangements and usages which glorify in the strongholds of Christianity, they make these the standard by which the gospel is to be explained and understood? Some "Reverend or Justice," without the light of inquiry or the aid of equity, catches the negro whom the kidnapper has dragged into his premises to the horrors of slavery. As the poor wretched shrieks and faints, Humanity shudders and demands why such atrocities are endured? Some "priest" or "devotee," "passing by on the other side," quite self-possessed and all complacent reads in reply from his broad phylactery, *Paul sent back Onesimus to Philemon!* Yes, echoes the negro-baiting mob, made up of "gentlemen of property and standing" together with equally gentlemen reeking from the gutter; Yes—*Paul sent back Onesimus to Philemon!* And Humanity, brow-beaten, steamed with noise and tumult, is pushed aside by the crowd! A fair specimen this of the manner in which modern usages are made to interpret the sacred Scriptures?

Of the particular passages in the New Testament on which the apologists for slavery especially rely, the epistle to Philemon first demands our attention.

1. This letter was written by the apostle Paul "while he was in prison" of Jesus Christ at Rome.

2. Philemon was a benevolent and trustworthy member of the church at Colosse, at whose house the disciples of Christ held their assemblies, and who owed his conversion, under God, directly or indirectly to the ministry of Paul.

3. Onesimus was the servant of Philemon; under a relation which it is difficult with accuracy and certainty to define. His condition, though servile, could not have been like that of an American slave; no, in that case, however he might have "wrought" Philemon, he could not also have "owed him ought." The American slave is, ac-

belonging to him, although the property of his master or any other slave, and can no more "owe" his master, than can a sheep or a horse. The basis of all pecuniary obligations lies in some "quid pro quo," "I have sold an article of merchandise" stand on this basis and sustain commercial relations to its owner? There is no person to offer or borrow. Personality is enshattered up in American slavery!

How Onesimus found his way to Rome it is not easy to determine. He and Philemon appear to have parted from each other on ill terms. The general character of Onesimus, certainly, in his relation to Philemon, had been far from attractive, and he seems to have left him without repairing the wrongs he had done him, or paying the debts which he owed him. At Rome, by the blessing of God upon the exertions of the apostle, he was brought to reflection and repentance.

5. In reviewing his history in the light of Christian truth, he became painfully aware of the injuries, he had inflicted on Philemon. He longed for an opportunity for frank confession and full restitution. Having, however, parted with Philemon on ill terms, he knew not how to appear in his presence. Under such embarrassments, he naturally sought sympathy and advice of Paul. His influence upon Philemon, Onesimus knew must be powerful, especially as an apostle.

6. A letter in behalf of Onesimus was therefore written by the apostle to Philemon. After such salutations, benedictions, and thanksgiving as the good character and useful life of Philemon naturally drew from the heart of Paul, he proceeds to the object of the letter. He admits that Onesimus had behaved ill in the service of Philemon; not in running away, for how they had parted with each other is not explained, but in being unprofitable and in refusing to pay the debts which he had contracted. But his character had undergone a radical change. Thenceforward fidelity and usefulness would be his aim and mark his course. And as to any pecuniary obligations which he had violated, the apostle authorized Philemon to put them on his account. Thus a way was fairly opened to the heart of Philemon. And now what does the apostle ask?

7. He asks that Philemon would receive Onesimus. How? "Not as a servant, but above a servant." How much above? Philemon

would receive him as "a son" of the apostle—as a brother beloved?—Why, if he esteemed Paul a partner, an equal, he would receive Onesimus as he would receive the apostle himself. So might there not have been a servant who was to receive him?

3. But was not this request to be so interpreted and complied with as to put Onesimus in the hands of Philemon as "an article of merchandise," *CARNAZZLY*, while it raised him to the dignity of a "brother beloved," *SPIRITUALLY*? In other words, might not Philemon comply only with the request of Paul have reduced Onesimus to a chattel, AS A MAN, while he admitted him fraternally to his bosom, as a *CHRISTIAN*? Such gibberish in an apostolic epistle! Never. As if, ever, to guard against such folly, the natural product of mist and machinery, the apostle would have Onesimus raised above a servant to the dignity of a brother beloved, "BOTH IN THE FLESH AND IN THE LORD;"† as a man and Christian, in all the relations, circumstances, and responsibilities of life.

It is easy now with definiteness and certainty to determine in what sense the apostle in such connections uses the word "brother." It describes a relation inconsistent with and opposite to the servile. It is "not" the relation of a "SERVANT." It elevates its subject "above" the servile condition. It raises him to full equality with the master, to the same equality, on which Paul and Philemon stood side by side as brothers; and this, not in some vague, undefined, spiritual sense, affecting the soul and leaving the body in bonds, but in every way, "both in the FLESH and in the Lord." This matter deserves particular and earnest attention. It sheds a strong light on other lessons of apostolic instruction.

4. It is greatly to our purpose, moreover, to observe that the apostle clearly defines the *moral character* of his request. It was fit, proper, right, suited to the nature and relations of things—a thing which *ought* to be done.‡ On this account, he might have urged it upon Philemon in the form of an *injunction*, on apostolic authority and with great boldness.§ *The very nature* of the request made it obliga-

• Verse 10, 16, 17.

† Verse 16.

‡ Verse 8. To *αρμοζον*. See Robinson's New Testament Lexicon; "it is fit, proper, becoming, it ought." In what sense King James' translators used the word "convenient" any one may see who will read Rom. i. 28 and Eph. v. 3, 4.

§ Verse 8.

of Philomen. He was already bound, out of regard to the life of things, to admit Quincius to full equality with himself, to count him as a brother both in the Lord and as having flesh and a fellow man. Thus were the inalienable rights and birth-right privileges of Quincius, as a member of the human family, defined and protected by apostolic authority.

13. The apostle preferred a request instead of imposing a command on the ground of *charity*.<sup>o</sup> He would give Philomen an opportunity of discharging his obligations under the impulse of love. To this impulse, he was confident Philomen would promptly and fully yield. How could he do otherwise? The thing itself was right. The request respecting it came from a benefactor, to whom, under God, he was under the highest obligations.<sup>†</sup> That benefactor, now an old man and in the hands of persecutors, manifested a deep and tender interest in the matter, and had the strongest persuasion that Philomen was more ready to grant than himself to entreat. The result, as he was soon to visit Colesse, and had commissioned Philomen to prepare a lodging for him, must come under the eye of the apostle. The request was so manifestly reasonable and obligatory, that the apostle, after all, described a compliance with it, by the strong word "*obedience*."<sup>‡</sup>

Now how must all this have been understood by the church at Colosse?—a church, doubtless, made up of such materials as the church at Corinth, that is, of members chiefly from the humblest walks of life. Many of them had probably felt the degradation and tasted the bitterness of the servile condition. Would they have been likely to interpret the apostle's letter under the bias of feelings friendly to slavery?—And put the slaveholder's construction on its contents? Would their past experience or present sufferings—for doubtless some of them were still "under the yoke"—have suggested to their thoughts such glosses as some of our theological professors venture to put upon the words of the apostle! Far otherwise. The Spirit of the Lord was there, and the epistle was read in the light of "*liberty*." It contained the principles of holy freedom, faithfully and affectionately applied. This must have made it precious in the eyes of such men "of low degree" as were most of the believers, and welcome to

<sup>o</sup> Verse 9—*δια της αγαρης*.

<sup>†</sup> Verse 10.

<sup>‡</sup> Verse 21.

a place in the calendar. "Then let it come on a business and powerful defense of the cause of emancipation. I am now at home." "Date it with the Rock-Strut!" "If any venerable, let him take command of Paul's sending Onesimus back to Philemon, with an apology for his running away, and sending him back to his master for life."<sup>2</sup>

"Paul sent back Onesimus to Philemon."—*Ey, what progress?* Did the apostle, a prisoner at Rome, come upon the fugitive, and drag him before some heartless and perfidious "Judge," for authorizing his return back to Colosse? Did he hurry his victim away, from the presence of the fat and supple magistrate, to be driven under chains and the lash to the field of unrequited toil, whence he had escaped? Had the apostle been like some teachers in the American churches, he might, as a professor of sacred literature in one of our seminaries, or a preacher of the gospel to the rich in some of our cities, have consented thus to subserve the "peculiar" interests of a depraved holding brother. But the venerable champion of truth and freedom was himself under bonds in the imperial city, waiting for the crown of martyrdom. He wrote a letter to the church at Colosse, which was accustomed to meet at the house of Philemon, and another letter to that magnanimous disciple, and sent them by the hand of Onesimus. So much for *the way*.. which Onesimus was sent back to his master.

A slave escapes from a patriarch in Georgia, and seeks a refuge in the parish of the Connecticut doctor, who once gave public notice that he saw no reason for caring for the servitude of his fellow men. Under his influence, Caesar becomes a Christian convert. Burning with love for the son whom he hath begotten in the gospel, our doctor resolves to send him back to his master. Accordingly, he writes a letter, gives it to Caesar, and bids him return, staff in hand, to the "corner-stone of our republican institutions." Now, what would any Caesar do, who had ever felt a link of slavery's chain? As he left his *spiritual father*, should we be surprized to hear him say to himself, "What return of my own accord to the man who, with the hand of a robber, plucked me from my mother's bosom?—for whom I

<sup>2</sup> See his letter to Dr. Fish, *supra* p. 8.

<sup>†</sup> "Why should I care?"



But how we are depicted in the eyes of our fellow-men, and  
 witness to often our daily and ordinary life, and the only  
 of light to any mind, who had claim to be a man, to  
 which my Doctor and Philomena only were entitled! And for that  
 all to be taken? To be taken, and mutilated, and sold, and  
 trampled, and torn, and destroyed! I can not then throw myself  
 away, and have cast upon my own destruction.

What the hope of the voluntary return of a fugitive from Ameri-  
 can oppression? Poly thinks that the doctor and his friends would  
 perhaps be able to carry it. For to the patriarch from whom he had been  
 seized? And must we believe this of Onesimus? "For the sake of  
 our Father's sake, Onesimus to Philemon." On what occasion, says  
 the apostle, "he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee ought,  
 put that on my account!" Alive to the claims of duty, Onesimus  
 would "restore" whatever he had taken away. He would bravely  
 pay his debts. "This resolution, the apostle warmly approved. He  
 was ready, at whatever expense, to help his young disciple in carrying  
 it into full effect. Of this he assured Philemon, in language the most  
 explicit and emphatic. Here we find one reason for the conduct of  
 Paul in sending Onesimus to Philemon.

If a fugitive slave of the Rev. Mr. Smylie, of Mississippi, should  
 return to him with a letter from a doctor of divinity in New York, con-  
 taining such an assurance, how would the reverend slaveholder dis-  
 pose of it? What, he exclaims, have we here? "If Cato has not  
 been upright in his pecuniary intercourse with you—if he owes you  
 any thing—put that on my account." What ignorance of southern  
 institutions! What mockery, to talk of pecuniary intercourse be-  
 tween a slave and his master! *The slave himself, with all he is and  
 has, is an article of merchandise.* What can he owe his master?—  
 A rustic may lay a wager with his mule, and give the creature the  
 peck of oats which he had permitted it to win. But who in color ear-  
 nest would call this a pecuniary transaction?

"To be his servant for life!" From what part of the epis-  
 tle could the expositor have evolved a thought so nothing to tyrants—  
 so revolting to every man who loves his own nature? From this?  
 "For perhaps he therefore departed for a season, that thou shouldest  
 receive him for ever." Receive him how? As a servant, exclaims  
 our commentator. But what wrote the apostle? "Not *as a*  
*servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved, especially to me, but*

any such man into place, both in the flesh and in the Church." With  
 abundant reason he can do hence the work of the Church. Can he  
 balance? According to Paul, Philomena was a woman of "great  
 strength." But, according to Stuart, he was a man of "great  
 strength." If the professor will apply the same rules of reasoning  
 to the writings of the abolitionists, all differences between him and  
 abolitionist in his view presently vanish away. The harmonizing  
 process would be equally simple and effectual. He has only to in-  
 ducement them as affirming what they deny, and denying what they  
 affirm.

Suppose that Prof. Stuart had a son residing at the South. His  
 love, having stolen money of his master, effected his escape. He  
 came to Andover, to find a refuge among the "sons of the prophet."  
 There he finds his way to Prof. Stuart's house, and offers to render  
 any service which the professor, dangerously ill "of a typhus  
 fever," might require. He is soon found to be a most willing,  
 skillful, faithful nurse. He spares no pains, night and day, to make  
 himself useful to the venerable sufferer. He anticipates every want.  
 In the most delicate and tender manner, he tries to soothe every pain.  
 He fastens himself strongly on the heart of the reverend object of  
 his care. Touched with the heavenly spirit, the meek demeanor, the  
 submissive frame, which the sick bed exhibits, Archy becomes a  
 Christian. A new bond now ties him and his convalescent teacher  
 together. As soon as he is able to write, the professor sends by  
 Archy the following letter to the South, to Isaac Stuart, Esq.

"Mr. Deam Son,—With a hand enfeebled by a distressing and  
 dangerous illness, from which I am slowly recovering, I address you  
 on a subject which lies very near my heart. I have a request to  
 make, which my acquaintance with you, and your strong obligations  
 to me, will, I can not doubt, make you eager fully to grant. I say a  
 request, though the thing I ask is, in its very nature and on the prin-  
 ciples of the gospel, obligatory upon you. I might, therefore, boldly  
 demand, what I earnestly entreat. But I know how generous, mag-  
 nanimous, and Christ-like you are, and how readily you will "do  
 even more than I say"—I, your own father, an old man, almost ex-  
 hausted with multiplied exertions for the benefit of my family and  
 my country, and now, just rising, emaciated and broken, from the  
 brink of the grave. I write in behalf of Archy, whom I regard with

abandonment of a father, and whom, indeed, I have forgotten in my selfishness. I really would have retained him, were he not a slave; but I did not hear his pleading voice; and without hand, and without answer to my want, remind me of you! I had a chance to give you an opportunity of manifesting, voluntarily, the goodness of your heart; as, if I had retained him with me, you might need to have been forced to grant what you will gratefully bestow. His temporary absence from you may have opened the way for his permanent continuance with you. Not now as a slave. Heaven forbid! But superior to a slave. Superior, did I say? Take him to your bosom, as a beloved brother; for I own him as a son; and regard him as such, in all the relations of life, both as a man and a Christian. I receive him as myself. And that nothing may hinder you from complying with my request at once, I hereby promise, without adding to your many and great obligations to me, to pay you every cent which he took from your drawer. Any preparation which my comfort with you may require, you will make without much delay, when you learn, that I intend, as soon as I shall be able to perform the journey, to make you a visit."

And what if Dr. Baxter, in giving an account of this letter should publicly declare that Prof. Stuart of Andover regarded slaveholding as lawful; for that "he had sent Archy back to his son Isaac, with an apology for his running away" to be held in perpetual slavery? With what propriety might not the professor exclaim: False, every syllable false. I sent him back, NOT TO BE HELD AS A SLAVE, but recognized as a dear brother, in all respects, under every relation, civil and ecclesiastical. I had my son receive Archy as myself. If this was not equivalent to a requisition to set him fully and most honorably free, and that, too, on the ground of natural obligation and Christian principle, then I know not how to frame such a requisition.

I am well aware that my supposition is by no means strong enough fully to illustrate the case to which it is applied. Prof. Stuart lacks a moral authority. Isaac Stuart is not a leading member of a church consisting, as the early churches chiefly consisted, of what the world regard as the dregs of society—the outcasts of all things. Nor was slavery at Colosse, it seems, supported by such barbarous usages, such horrid laws as disgrace the South.

But it is time to turn to another passage which, in its bearing on the subject in hand, is, in our view, as well as in the view of Dr. Fisk

and Prof. Stuart, in the highest degree authoritative and instructive, declare many converts to be under the yoke, count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, do not despise them because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit.

1. The apostle addresses himself here to two classes of servants, with instructions to each respectively appropriate. Both the one class and the other, in Prof. Stuart's eye, were *slaves*. This he assumes, and thus begs the very question in dispute. The term servant is generic, as used by the sacred writers. It comprehends all the various offices which men discharge for the benefit of each other, however honorable, or however menial; from that of an apostle opening the path to heaven, to that of washing "one another's feet." A general term it is, comprehending every office which belongs to human relations and Christian character.

A leading signification gives us the *manual laborer*, to whom, in the division of labor, muscular exertion was allotted. As in his exertions the bodily powers are especially employed—such powers as belong to man in common with mere animals—his sphere has generally been considered low and humble. And as intellectual power is superior to bodily, the manual laborer has always been exposed in many numerous ways and in various degrees to oppression. Cunning, intrigue, the oily tongue, have, through extended and powerful conspiracies, brought the resources of society under the control of the few, who stood aloof from his homely toil. Hence his dependence upon them. Hence the multiplied injuries which have fallen so heavily upon him. Hence the reduction of his wages from one degree to another, till at length, in the case of millions, fraud and violence strip him of his all, blot his name from the record of mankind, and putting a yoke upon his neck, drive him away to toil among the cattle. Here you find the slave. To reduce the servant to his condition, requires abuses altogether monstrous—injuries reaching the very vitals of man—stabs upon the very heart of humanity. Now, what right has Prof. Stuart to make the word "servants," comprehending, even as manual laborers, so many and such various meanings, signify "slaves," especially where different classes are

...and a rigorous and absolute obedience to the law of God, of philosophy, or of human institutions. ...

...different classes. This is implied in the term *the yoke*, ...  
...to either, who are introduced by a particle, whose ...  
...meaning indicates the presence of another and a different subject.

1. The first class are described as "*under the yoke*"—a yoke from which they were, according to the apostle, to make their escape if possible. If not, they must in every way regard the master with respect—bowing to his authority, working his will, subserving his interests so far as might be consistent with Christian character.

2. To prevent blasphemy—to prevent the pagan master from heaping profane reproaches upon the name of God and the doctrines of the gospel. They should beware of rousing his passions, which, as his helpless victims, they might be unable to allay or withstand.

But all the servants whom the apostle addressed were not "*under the yoke*"—an instrument appropriate to cattle and to slaves. There he distinguishes from another class, who instead of a "*yoke*"—the badge of a slave—had "*believing masters*."

To have a "*believing master*," then, was equivalent to freedom from "*the yoke*." These servants were exhorted not to despise their masters. What need of such an exhortation, if their masters had been slaveholders, holding them as property, wielding them as mere instruments, disposing of them as articles of merchandise?

But this was not consistent with believing. Faith, "*breaking every yoke*," united master and servants in the bonds of brotherhood. Brethren they were, joined in a relation which, excluding the yoke, placed them side by side on the ground of equality, where, each in his appropriate sphere, they might serve themselves freely and usefully, to the mutual benefit of each other.

Here, servants might need to be cautioned against getting above their appropriate business, putting on airs, despising their masters, ...

o Ode. See Farrow's Schneider.

† As. See Farrow.

1 See 1 Cor. vii. 21—*Αλλ' εἰ καὶ οὐκ ἐστέ ἐλευθεροί, γυνέσθαι*.

2 1 Cor. vii. 22—*Εἰ γυνέσθε δοῦλοι ἀνθρώπων.*

3 See Lev. xvi. 18; Isa. lvi. 3, 9.

4 See p. 67.

and their desiring or accepting their service. Instead of this, they should be as emancipated slaves often have been, without color and pride, selfish activity, and usefulness—especially as they were "worthy of their confidence and love," their help in their well-doing.

Such, then, is the relation between those who, in the view of Paul and Timothy, were Christian masters and Christian slaves—the relation of "brethren," which, excluding "the yoke," and of course compulsion, placed them side by side on the common ground of mutual service, both retaining, for convenience's sake, the one while giving and the other while receiving employment, the correlative name of *servant* in each case, under which they had been known. Such was the instruction which Timothy was required, as a Christian minister, to give. Was it friendly to slaveholding?

§ 13. See Matt. vi. 24.

§ 14. These, for instance, not free by that "believing master." James G. Birney.

§ 15. The following exposition is from the pen of ELIZUR WEAVER, JR.

This word [*συνδουλός*, *Syndoulos*,] in our humble opinion, has been so unfairly used by the commentators, that we feel constrained to take its part. Our excellent translators, in rendering the clause 'partakers of the benefit,' evidently lost sight of the component preposition, which expresses the *opposition of reciprocity*, rather than the *connection of participation*. They have given it exactly the sense of *συνδουλός*, *Syndoulos*, (2 Tim. ii. 6.) Had the apostle intended such a sense, he would have used the latter verb, or one of the more common words, *μετέχοι*, *metechou*, &c. (See Heb. iii. 1, and 1 Tim. v. 22, where the latter word is used in the sense, 'neither be partaker of other men's sins.' Had the verb in our text been used, it might have been rendered, 'neither be the part-taker of other men's sins.' The primary sense of *συνδουλός*, *Syndoulos*, is *to take in return*—*to take instead of*—the Hebrew, in the middle with the genitive, it signifies *assist*, or *do one's part towards* the person or thing expressed by that genitive. In this sense only is the word used in the New Testament.—(See Luke i. 54, and Acts xi. 35.) If this be true, the word *συνδουλός* can not signify the benefit conferred by the gospel, as our common version would make it, but the *well-doing* of the servants, who should continue to serve their believing masters, while they were no longer under the yoke of compulsion. This word is used elsewhere in the New Testament but once, (Acts iv. 2) in relation to the 'good deed' done to the impotent man. The plain import of the clause, unperverted by the commentators, is, that believing masters would not fail to do their part towards, or encourage by suitable returns, the free service of those who had once been under the yoke."

§ Letter to Dr. Fish, supra, p. 7.

belong to the province of Christianity, servants were at liberty to  
 their masters. The government of the soul, was reserved to them. They  
 were as free as birds, and as active as bees. They were at liberty to  
 and for high results, to the other. They were at liberty to  
 their master imposed no restrictions, imposed no calumnies, im-  
 posed no impediments. And this, clearly and fully, is implied in  
 perfect religious equality, which the Christian professors acknowledge as a  
 wants in relation to their masters. Alas! the master, when, in order  
 more fully to attain the great ends for which he was created and  
 deemed, freely exert himself to improve his acquaintance with his  
 own powers, and relations, and resources.—with his prospects, oppor-  
 tunities, and advantages? So might his servants. Was he at liberty  
 to “study to approve himself to God,” to submit to his will and bow  
 to his authority, as the sole standard of affection and exertion? So  
 were they. Was he at liberty to sanctify the Sabbath, and frequent  
 the “solemn assembly?” So were they. Was he at liberty as to  
 honor the filial, conjugal, and paternal relations, as to find in them that  
 spring of activity and that source of enjoyment, which they are ca-  
 pable of yielding? So were they. In every department of interest  
 and exertion, they might use their capacities, and wield their powers,  
 and improve their opportunities, and employ their resources, as freely  
 as he, in glorifying God, in blessing mankind, and in laying up im-  
 perishable treasures for themselves! Give perfect religious equality  
 to the American slave, and the most eager abolitionist must be satisfi-  
 ed. Such equality would, like the breath of the Almighty, dissolve  
 the last link of the chain of servitude. Dare those who, for the bene-  
 fit of slavery, have given so wide and active a circulation to the  
 Pittsburgh pamphlet, make the experiment?

\* In the epistle to the Colossians, the following passage deserves ear-  
 nest attention:—“Servants, obey in all things your masters accord-  
 ing to the flesh; not with eye-service, as men-pleasers; but in sin-  
 gleness of heart, fearing God: and whatsoever ye do, do it heartily,

...and, and not only men; for also, that of the Lord, in  
...of the inhabitants; for ...  
... But let death wrong shall receive for ...  
... in no respect of persons ...  
... that which is just and equal; for ...  
... have a Master in heaven."

Here it is natural to remark—

1. That in maintaining the relation, which mutually united them, both masters and servants were to act in conformity with the rules of the divine government. Whatever they did, servants were to do in hearty obedience to the Lord, by whose authority they were to be controlled and by whose hand they were to be rewarded. To the same Lord, and according to the same law, was the master to hold himself responsible. *Both the one and the other were of course equal. By at liberty and alike required to study and apply the standard, by which they were to be governed and judged.*

2. The basis of the government under which they thus were placed, was righteousness—strict, stern, impartial. Nothing here of bias or antipathy. Birth, wealth, station,—the dust of the balance not so light! Both master and servants were hastening to a tribunal, where nothing of "respect of persons" could be feared or hoped for. There the wrong-doer, whoever he might be, and whether from the top or bottom of society, must be dealt with according to his deservings.

3. Under this government, servants were to be universally and heartily obedient; and both in the presence and absence of the master, faithfully to discharge their obligations. The master on his part, in his relations to the servants, was to make JUSTICE AND EQUALITY the standard of his conduct. Under the authority of such instructions, slavery falls discountenanced, condemned, abhorred. It is flagrantly at war with the government of God, consists in "respect of persons" the most shameless and outrageous, treads justice and equality under foot, and in its natural tendency and practical effects is nothing else than a system of wrong-doing. What have they to do with the just and the equal who in their "respect of persons" proceed to such a pitch as to treat one brother as a thing because he is a servant, and place him, without the least regard to his welfare here, or his prospects hereafter, absolutely at the disposal of another brother.



and the *right of property*, to the *right of property*? *Equality* on the one hand, and the *chattel principle* on the other, are mutually exclusive of each other—*peace* and *justice*—the *abolition*, *justice* and *peace*, cannot here be considered *slaves* or *owners*, without the greatest absurdity and the greatest violence.

"The relation of slavery," according to Prof. Stuart, is recognized in "the precepts of the New Testament," as one which "may still exist without violating the Christian faith or the church." Slavery and the chattel principle! So our professor thinks; otherwise his reference has nothing to do with the subject—with the slavery which the abolitionist, whom he derides, stands opposed to. How gross and hurtful is the mistake into which he allows himself to fall. The relation recognized in the precepts of the New Testament had its basis and support in "justice and equality;" the very opposite of the chattel principle; a relation which may exist as long as justice and equality remain, and thus escape the destruction to which, in the view of Prof. Stuart, slavery is doomed. The description of Paul obliterates every feature of American slavery, raising the servant to equality with his master, and placing his rights under the protection of justice; yet the eye of Prof. Stuart can see nothing in his master and servant but a slave and his owner. With this relation he is so thoroughly possessed, that, like an evil angel, it haunts him even when he enters the temple of justice!

"It is remarkable," saith the Princeton professor, "that there is not even an exhortation" in the writings of the apostles "to masters to liberate their slaves, much less is it urged as an imperative and immediate duty."† It would be remarkable, indeed, if they were chargeable with a defect so great and glaring. And so they have nothing to say upon the subject? That not even the Princeton professor has the assurance to affirm. He admits that *KINDNESS, MERCY, AND JUSTICE*, were enjoined with a *distinct reference to the government of God*.‡ "Without respect of persons," they were to be God-like in doing justice. They were to act the part of kind and merciful "brethren." And whither would this lead them? Could they stop short of restoring to every man his natural, inalienable rights?—of doing

◦ Letter to Dr. Fisk, supra p. 7.

† Pittsburgh pamphlet, p. 9.

‡ Pittsburgh pamphlet p. 10.

what they could to relieve the wrongs, soothe the sorrows, improve the character, and raise the condition of the degraded and oppressed. Especially, if oppressed and degraded by any agency of theirs. Could it be kind, merciful, or just to keep the chains of slavery on their helpless, unoffending brother? Would this be to honor the Golden Rule, or obey the second great command of "their Master in heaven"? Could the apostles have subverted the cause of freedom more directly, intelligibly, and effectually, than to *enjoin the principles, and sentiments, and habits, in which freedom consists—constituting its living root and fruitful germ?*

The Princeton professor himself, in the very paper which the South has so warmly welcomed and so loudly applauded as a scriptural defense of "the peculiar institution," maintains, that the "**GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF THE GOSPEL HAVE DESTROYED SLAVERY throughout the greater part of Christendom**"\*—"THAT CHRISTIANITY HAS ABOLISHED BOTH POLITICAL AND DOMESTIC BONDAGE WHEREVER IT HAS HAD FREE SCOPE—that it ENJOINS a fair compensation for labor; insists on the mental and intellectual improvement of ALL classes of men; condemns ALL infractions of marital or parental rights; requires in short not only that FREE SCOPE should be allowed to human improvement, but that ALL SUITABLE MEANS should be employed for the attainment of that end."† It is indeed "remarkable," that while neither Christ nor his apostles ever gave "an exhortation to masters to liberate their slaves," they enjoined such "general principles as have destroyed domestic slavery throughout the greater part of Christendom;" that while Christianity forbears "to urge" emancipation "as an imperative and immediate duty," it throws a barrier, heaven high, around every domestic circle; protects all the rights of the husband and the fathers; gives every laborer a fair compensation; and makes the moral and intellectual improvement of all classes, with free scope and all suitable means, the object of its tender solicitude and high authority. This is not only "remarkable," but inexplicable. Yea and no—hot and cold, in one and the same breath! And yet these things stand prominent in what is reckoned an acute, ingenious, effective defense of slavery!

\* Pittsburgh pamphlet p. 18. 19.    † The same p. 31.



3. The apostle, however, forbids them *not* to acquiesce in the servile relation, *not* to act inconsistently with their Christian obligations. To their Savior they belonged. By his blood they had been purchased. It should be their great object, therefore, to render *Him* a hearty and effective service. They should permit no man, whoever he might be, to thrust in himself between them and their Redeemer. "*Ye are bought with a price; BE NOT YE THE SERVANTS OF MEN.*"

With his eye upon the passage just quoted and explained, the Princeton professor asserts that "Paul represents this relation"—the relation of slavery—"as of comparatively little account."\* And this he applies—otherwise it is nothing to his purpose—to American slavery. Does he then regard it as a small matter, a mere trifle, to be thrown under the slave-laws of this republic, grimly and fiercely excluding their victim from almost every means of improvement, and field of usefulness, and source of comfort; and making him, body and substance, with his wife and babes, "the servant of men?" Could such a relation be acquiesced in consistently with the instructions of the apostle?

To the Princeton professor we commend a practical trial of the bearing of the passage in hand upon American slavery. His regard for the unity and prosperity of the ecclesiastical organizations, which in various forms and under different names unite the southern with the northern churches, will make the experiment grateful to his feelings. Let him, then, as soon as his convenience will permit, proceed to Georgia. No religious teacher † from any free state, can be likely

\* Pittsburgh pamphlet p. 10.

† Rev. Mr. Savage, of Utica, New York, had, not very long ago, a free conversation with a gentleman of high standing in the literary and religious world from a slaveholding state, where the "peculiar institution" is cherished with great warmth and maintained with iron rigor. By him, Mr. Savage was assured, that the Princeton professor had, through the Pittsburgh pamphlet, contributed most powerfully and effectually to bring the "whole South" under the persuasion, *that slaveholding is in itself right—a system to which the Bible gives countenance and support.*

In an extract from an article in the Southern Christian Sentinel, a new Presbyterian paper established in Charleston, South Carolina, and inserted in the Christian Journal for March 21, 1839, we find the following paragraphs from the pen of Rev. C. W. Howard, and according to Mr. Chester, ably and freely endorsed by the editor. "There is scarcely any diversity of sentiment at the North upon this subject. The great mass of the people believing slavery to be sinful, are clearly of the opinion that as a system, it should be abolished throughout this land and throughout the world

to receive so general and so warm a welcome there. To allay the heat, which the doctrines and movements of the abolitionists have occasioned in the southern mind, let him with as much despatch as possible collect, as he goes from place to place, masters and their slaves. Now let all men, whom it may concern, see and own that slavery is a Christian institution! With his Bible in his hand and his eye upon the passage in question, he addresses himself to the task of instructing the slaves around him. Let not your hearts, my brethren, be overcharged with sorrow, or eaten up with anxiety. Your servile condition cannot deprive you of the fatherly regards of Him "who is no respecter of persons." Freedom you ought, indeed, to prefer. If you can escape from "the yoke," throw it off. In the mean time rejoice that "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty;" that the Gospel places slaves "on a perfect religious equality" with their master; so that every Christian is "the Lord's freeman." And, for your encouragement, remember that "Christianity has abolished both political and domestic servitude whenever it has had free scope. It enjoins a fair compensation for labor; it insists on the moral and intellectual improvement of all classes of men; it condemns all infractions of marital or parental rights; in short it requires not only that free scope be allowed to human improvement, but that all means should be employed for the attainment of that end."\*

They differ as to time and mode of abolition. The abolitionists consistently argue, that whatever *evil* should be instantly abandoned. The others, by a *strange sort of reasoning for Christian men*, contend that though slavery is sinful, yet it may be allowed to exist until it shall be expedient to abolish it; or if, in many cases, this reasoning might be translated into plain English, the sense would be, both in church and State, slavery, though sinful, may be allowed to exist until our interest will suffer us to say that it must be abolished. This is not slander; it is simply a plain way of stating a plain truth. It does seem the evident duty of every man to become an abolitionist, who believes slavery to be sinful, for the Bible allows no tampering with sin.

"To these remarks, there are some noble exceptions to be found in both parties in the church. *The South owes a debt of gratitude to the Biblical Repertory, for the fearless argument in behalf of the position, that slavery is not forbidden by the Bible.* The writer of that article is said, without contradiction, to be Prof. Hodge of Princeton—**HIS NAME OUGHT TO BE KNOWN AND REVERED AMONG YOU**, my brethren, for in a land of anti-slavery men, he is the **ONLY ONE** who has dared to vindicate your character from the serious charge of living in the habitual transgression of God's holy law."/

\* Pittsburgh pamphlet p. 31.

love and devotion to the service of God. "Do not go to the servants of men." Let no human arrangements prevent you, as citizens of the kingdom of heaven, from making the most of your powers and opportunities. Would such an effort, generally and heartily made, allay excitement at the South, and quench the flames of discord, every day rising higher and waxing hotter, in almost every part of the republic, and cement "the Union?"

"It is," affirms the Princeton professor, "on all hands acknowledged, that, at the time of the advent of Jesus Christ, slavery in its worst forms prevailed over the whole world. *The Savior found it around him in JUDÆA.*" To say that he found it *in Judea*, is to speak ambiguously. Many things were to be found "in Judea," which neither belonged to, nor were characteristic of *the Jews*. It is not denied that *the Gentiles*, who resided among them, might have had slaves; *but of the Jews this is denied*. How could the professor take that as granted, the proof of which entered vitally into the argument and was essential to the soundness of the conclusions to which he would conduct us? How could he take advantage of an ambiguous expression to conduct his confiding readers on to a position which, if his own eyes were open, he must have known they could not hold in the light of open day?

We do not charge the Savior with any want of wisdom, goodness, or courage,† for refusing to "break down the wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles" "before the time appointed." While this barrier stood, he could not, consistently with the plan of redemption, impart instruction freely to the Gentiles. To some extent, and on extraordinary occasions, he might have done so. But his business then was with "the lost sheep of the house of Israel."‡ The propriety of this arrangement is not the matter of dispute between the Princeton professor and ourselves.

In disposing of the question whether the Jews held slaves during our Savior's incarnation among them, the following points deserve earnest attention:—

1. Slaveholding is inconsistent with the Mosaic economy. For

9 Pittsburgh pamphlet p. 9. . † The same, p. 10. ‡ Matt. xv. 24.

the Jews, as a nation, represented the most degraded and idolatrous people of the world, and doubly representative of the most degraded and idolatrous nations of the world, in the degradation and magnitude of the idolatry which they had derived from whatever was characteristic of Babylonians and Egyptians. From idolatry and slaveholding—the two evils which had always so greatly prevailed among the heathen—they seem at length, as the result of a most painful discipline, to have been specially directed.

3. While, therefore, John the Baptist, with marked fidelity and courage, acted among the Jews the part of a repressor, he found it necessary to repeat and apply the language of his predecessors, in exposing and rebuking idolatry and slaveholding. Could he, the greatest of the prophets, have been less effectually aroused by the presence of "the yoke," than was Isaiah?—or less interested and agitated in exposing and denouncing the general oppression under its most hateful and injurious forms?

4. The Savior was not backward in applying *his own* principles plainly and pointedly to such forms of oppression as appeared among the Jews. These principles, whenever they have been freely acted on, the Princeton professor admits, have abolished domestic bondage. And this prevailed within the sphere of our Savior's ministry: he could not, consistently with his general character, have failed to expose and condemn it. The oppression of the people by lordly ecclesiastics, of parents by their selfish children, of widows by their ghostly counsellors, drew from his lips scorching rebukes and terrible denunciations. How, then, must he have felt and spoke in the presence of such brutality, if such brutality had been *within his official sphere*, as should have *made known*, by driving their husbands to some flesh-market, and their children not orphans, but *settles*?

5. Domestic slavery was manifestly inconsistent with the *industry*, which, in the form of manual labor, so generally prevailed among the Jews. In one connection, in the Acts of the Apostles, we are informed, that, coming from Athens to Corinth, Paul "found a certain Jew

\* "The Bible against Slavery."

† Psalm lxxvii; Isa. lviii. 1—12; Jer. xlii. 13—16.

‡ Matt. xxiii; Mark vii. 1—13.





18. A society that, in the very spirit of civilization, is inclined to be a benefactor to the poor, is bound to the lowest and meanest of the despoticisms among the Jews. With prodigies, publicans even joined and approved and countenanced. The outcasts of society were cherished, not in order to keep them slaves, but as deserving a place among Samaritans and Ishmaelites. They were "hired servants," where slaves employed. In the parable of the prodigal son, we have a Jewish family. Here servants seem to have abounded. The prodigal, bitterly bewailing his wretchedness and folly, described their condition as greatly superior to his own. How happy the change which should place him by their side! His remorse, and shame, and penitence made him willing to embrace the lot of the lowest of them all. But these--what was their condition? They were **Hired Servants**. "Make me as one of thy hired servants." Such he refers to as the lowest menials known in Jewish life.

Lay such hints as have now been suggested together; let it be remembered, that slavery was inconsistent with the Mosaic economy; that John the Baptist in preparing the way for the Messiah makes no reference "to the yoke" which, had it been before him, he would, like Isaiah, have condemned; that the Savior, while he took the part of the poor and sympathized with the oppressed, was evidently spared the pain of witnessing within the sphere of his ministry, the presence of the chattel principle; that it was the habit of the Jews, whoever they might be, high or low, rich or poor, learned or rude, "to labor, working with their hands;" and that where reference was had to the most menial employments, in families, they were described as carried on by hired servants; and the question of slavery "in Judea," so far as the seed of Abraham were concerned, is very easily disposed of. With every phase and form of society among them slavery was inconsistent.

The position which, in the article so often referred to in this paper, the Princeton professor takes, is sufficiently remarkable. Northern abolitionists he saw in an earnest struggle with southern slaveholders. The present welfare and future happiness of myriads of the human family were at stake in this contest. In the heat of the battle, he throws himself between the belligerent powers. He gives the abolitionists to understand, that they are quite mistaken in the character of the object they have set themselves so openly and sternly against. Slaveholding is not, as they suppose, contrary to the law of God. It was

was taken by the Savior "in the worst form," without crediting him with a syllable of notice. "The learned writers did not condemn it." } And why should they? By a definition sufficiently ambiguous and slippery, he undertakes to set forth a form of slavery which he looks upon as consistent with the law of Righteousness. From this definition he infers that the abolitionists are greatly to blame for maintaining that American slavery is inherently and essentially sinful, and for insisting that it ought at once to be abolished. For this labor of love the slaveholding South is warmly grateful and applauds its reverend ally, as if a very Daniel had come as their advocate to judgment. §

A few questions, briefly put, may not here be inappropriate.

1. Was the form of slavery which our professor pronounces innocent the form witnessed by our Savior "in Judea?" That, he will by no means admit. The slavery there was, he affirms, of the "worst" kind. How then does he account for the alleged silence of the Savior?—a silence covering the essence and the form—the institution and its "worst" abuses?

2. Is the slaveholding, which, according to the Princeton professor, Christianity justifies, the same as that which the abolitionists so earnestly wish to see abolished? Let us see.

*Christianity in supporting Slavery,  
according to Prof. Hodge,*

"Enjoins a fair compensation for labor."

"It insists on the moral and intellectual improvement of all classes of men."

"It condemns all infractions of marital or parental rights."

"It requires that free scope should be allowed to human improvement."

"It requires that all suitable means should be employed to improve mankind."

"Wherever it has had free scope, it has abolished domestic bondage."

*The American system for supporting  
Slavery,*

"Makes compensation impossible by reducing the laborer to a chattel."

"It sternly forbids its victim to learn to read even the name of his Creator and Redeemer."

"It outlaws the conjugal and parental relations."

"It forbids any effort, on the part of myriads of the human family, to improve their character, condition, and prospects."

"It inflicts heavy penalties for teaching letters to the poorest of the poor."

"Wherever it has free scope, it perpetuates domestic bondage."

Now it is slavery according to the American system that the abolitionists are set against. Of the existence of any such form of slavery as is consistent with Prof. Hodge's account of the requisitions of

\* Pittsburgh pamphlet p. 9. † The same p. 13. ‡ The same p. 12. § Supra p. 61.

Christianity, they know nothing. It has never met their passions and passions, and never roused their feelings, or called forth their reason. What then have they to do with the customs and maxims which the Princeton professor deals around? Let those who have leisure and good-nature protect the man of straw he is so hot against. The abolitionists have other business. It is not the signet of a sickly brain; but that system of oppression which in theory is corrupting, and in practice destroying both Church and State;—it is this that they feel pledged to do battle upon, till by the just judgment of Almighty God it is thrown, dead and damned, into the bottomless abyss.

3. *How can the South feel itself protected by any shield which may be thrown over SUCH SLAVERY, as may be consistent with what the Princeton professor describes as the requisitions of Christianity?* Is this *THE* slavery which their laws describe, and their hands maintain? "Fair compensation for labor"—"marital and parental rights"—"free scope" and "all suitable means" for the "improvement, moral and intellectual, of all classes of men;"—are these, according to the statutes of the South, among the objects of slaveholding legislation? Every body knows that any such requisition and American slavery are flatly opposed to and directly subversive of each other. What service, then, has the Princeton professor, with all his ingenuity and all his zeal, rendered the "peculiar institution?" Their gratitude must be of a stamp and complexion quite peculiar, if they can thank him for throwing their "domestic system" under the weight of such Christian requisitions as must at once crush its snaky head "and grind it to powder."

And what, moreover, is the bearing of the Christian requisitions which Prof. Hodge quotes, upon the definition of slavery which he has elaborated? "All the ideas which necessarily enter into the definition of slavery are, deprivation of personal liberty, obligation of service at the discretion of another, and the transferable character of the authority and claim of service of the master."<sup>\*</sup>

According to Prof. Hodge's account of the requisitions of Christianity, The spring of effort in the laborer is a fair compensation.

According to Prof. Hodge's definition of Slavery,

The laborer must serve at the discretion of another.

\* Pittsburgh pamphlet p. 12.

...the same man who has been for years  
...with the same feelings...

...the right as a husband and a father  
...as to be protected.

...the same man who has been for years  
...with the same feelings...

The authority and claims of the same  
...they throw an ocean between him  
...and his family, and separate them from  
...each other's presence at any moment and  
...forever.

Christianity, then, requires such slavery as Prof. Hodge so un-  
namingly defines, to be abolished. It was well provided, for the peace  
of the respective parties, that he placed his definition so far from the  
requisitions of Christianity. Had he brought them into each other's  
presence, their natural and invincible antipathy to each other would  
have broken out into open and exterminating warfare. But why  
should we delay longer upon an argument which is based on gross  
and monstrous sophistry? It can mislead only such as wish to be  
misled. The lovers of sunlight are in little danger of rushing into  
the professor's dungeon. Those who, having something to conceal,  
covet darkness, can find it there, to their hearts' content. The hour  
can not be far away, when upright and reflective minds at the South  
will be astonished at the blindness which could welcome such protec-  
tion as the Princeton argument offers to the slaveholder.

But Prof. Stuart must not be forgotten. In his celebrated letter  
to Dr. Fisk, he affirms that "*Paul did not expect slavery to be ousted  
in a day.*"\* Did not expect! What then? Are the requisitions of  
Christianity adapted to any EXPECTATIONS which in any quarter and  
on any ground might have risen to human consciousness? And are  
we to interpret the precepts of the Gospel by the expectations of  
Paul? The Savior commanded all men every where to repent, and  
this, though "Paul did not expect" that human wickedness, in its  
ten thousand forms would in any community "be ousted in a day."  
Expectations are one thing; requisitions quite another.

In the mean time, while expectation waited, Paul, the professor  
adds, "gave precepts to Christians respecting their demeanor." That  
he did. Of what character were these precepts? Must they not  
have been in harmony with the Golden Rule? But this, according  
to Prof. Stuart, "decides against the righteousness of slavery,"  
even as a "theory." Accordingly, Christians were required, without

\* Supra, p. 8.

...to cherish and express in all their intercourse that tender love and disinterested charity which can never mutually feel for another. These were the "ad interim precepts," which, can not fail, if obeyed, to cut up slavery, "root and branch," at once and forever.

Prof. Stuart comforts us with the assurance, that "*Christianity will ultimately certainly destroy slavery.*" Of this we have not the feeblest doubt. But how could he admit a persuasion and utter a prediction so much at war with the doctrine he maintains, that "*slavery may exist without violating the Christian faith or the church?*"<sup>†</sup> What, Christianity bent on the destruction of an ancient and cherished institution which hurts neither her character nor condition! Why not correct its abuses and purify its spirit; and shedding upon it her own beauty, preserve it, as a living trophy of her reformatory power? Whence the discovery that, in her onward progress, she would trample down and destroy what was no way hurtful to her? This is to be aggressive with a witness. Far be it from the Judge of all the earth to whelm the innocent and guilty in the same destruction! In aid of Professor Stuart, in the rude and scarcely covert attack which he makes upon himself, we maintain that Christianity will certainly destroy slavery on account of its inherent wickedness—its malignant temper—its deadly effects—its constitutional, insolent, and unmitigable opposition to the authority of God and the welfare of man.

"Christianity will *ultimately* destroy slavery." "ULTIMATELY!" What meaneth that portentous word? To what limit of remotest time, concealed in the darkness of futurity, may it look? Tell us, O watchman, on the hill of Andover. Almost nineteen centuries have rolled over this world of wrong and outrage—and yet we tremble in the presence of a form of slavery whose breath is poison, whose fang is death! If any one of the incidents of slavery should fall, but for a single day, upon the head of the prophet who dipped his pen, in such cold blood, to write that word "*ultimately,*" how, under the sufferings of the first tedious hour, would he break out in the lamentable cry, "How long, O Lord, how long!" In the agony of beholding a wife or daughter

\* Letter to Dr. Fisk, p. 8.

† The same, p. 7.

‡ Prof. Stuart applies here the words, *salva fide et salva ecclesia.*

upon the table of the agonies, while every knell tolls upon his heart like the groan of despair, and comfort would he find in the dull assurance of some heartless prophet, quitted at "enso in fero," that "*ultimately Christianity would destroy slavery.*" As the hammer falls and the beloved of his soul, all helpless and most wretched, is borne away to the haunts of *legalized debauchery*, his heart turns to stone, while the cry dies upon his lips, "*How long, O Lord, how long?*"

"*Ultimately?*" In *what circumstances* does Prof. Stuart assure himself that Christianity will destroy slavery? Are we, as American citizens, under the sceptre of a Nero? When, as integral parts of this republic—as living members of this community, did we forfeit the prerogatives of *freemen*? Have we not the right to speak and act as wielding the powers which the principle of self-government has put in our possession? And without asking leave of priest or statesman, of the North or the South, may we not make the most of the freedom which we enjoy under the guaranty of the ordinances of Heaven and the Constitution of our country? Can we expect to see Christianity on higher vantage-ground than in this country she stands upon? In the midst of a republic based on the principle of the equality of mankind, where every Christian, as vitally connected with the state, freely wields the highest political rights and enjoys the richest political privileges; where the unanimous demand of one-half of the members of the churches would be promptly met in the abolition of slavery, what "*ultimately*" must Christianity here wait for before she crushes the chattel principle beneath her heel? Her triumph over slavery is retarded by nothing but the corruption and defection so widely spread through the "sacramental host" beneath her banners! Let her voice be heard and her energies exerted, and the *ultimately* of the "dark spirit of slavery" would at once give place to the *immediately* of the Avenger of the Poor.